DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 413 845 HE 030 757

AUTHOR Shipps, Kenneth W.
TITLE Building Curricular Coherence through the Teaching of Classic Texts at Eleven Colleges.
INSTITUTION Phillips Univ., Enid, OK.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 1991-08-31
NOTE 103p.
CONTRACT P116B81859-89
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classics (Literature); *College Instruction; Curriculum Development; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Instructional Improvement; Interdisciplinary Approach; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Seminars; Summer Programs; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This final report describes activities and accomplishments of a 3-year project of faculty and curricular development using a variety of classic texts and involving 10 liberal arts colleges and one state university. Three-week summer seminars were held for faculty who studied self-selected classics introduced by master teachers, and discussed teaching strategies and curriculum possibilities. Of the 200 faculty participants, almost all reported the strategies created a community of interest and progress on the major issues. Positive student outcomes were also found; there was 10 percent increased student retention at one institution, significant improvement of critical thinking skills at another, and positive gains in student attitudes toward key issues at another. Four colleges and the state university did not continue the project, apparently due to leadership collapse and fragmented disciplinary cultures. External evaluation supported the project's success at the other seven institutions. Individual sections present an overview of the project and describe the project's purpose, background and origins, organization and activities, and results. Six appendices include a report of the pilot project at Phillips University (Oklahoma), a summary of activities at each institution, student and faculty surveys, conference material, and the external evaluation report. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED 413 845

COVER SHEET

BUILDING CURRICULAR COHERENCE THROUGH THE TEACHING OF CLASSIC TEXTS AT ELEVEN COLLEGES.

Granter Organization: Phillips University
P. O. Box 2000, University Station
Enid, Oklahoma 73702

Grant Number: P116B81859-89

Project Dates:

Starting Date:	September 1, 1988
Ending Date:	August 31, 1991
Number of Months:	36

Project Director: Dr. Kenneth W. Shipps, Academic Vice President
Academic Office
Phillips University
P. O. Box 2000, University Station
Enid, Oklahoma 73702
Telephone: 405/237-4433

FIPSE Program Officer: Jaymie Lewis

Grant Award:

Year 1:	$ 39,046
Year 2:	129,543
Year 3:	20,818
Total:	189,407

HE 030 757

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROJECT SUMMARY

Between September of 1988 and August of 1991 ten liberal arts colleges and one state university participated in a faculty and curricular development project using a variety of living classic texts. Based on a successful FIPSE pilot project at Phillips University, the project aimed to use certain faculty development strategies to attack major issues in American higher education - lack of agreed-upon common content for general study, the clear interrelatedness of common content from course to course and the issue of effective teaching strategies, especially for classic texts. Strategies: three week summer seminars for faculty who would study self-selected classics introduced by master teachers and lead discussion on teaching strategies and curricular possibilities. Of the two hundred faculty participants at the eleven institutions, almost all reported the strategies created a community of interest and progress in work on the major issues. The external evaluator agreed. At the end of the project seven of the institutions were highly committed to the model posed by Phillips University. A few results related to students. At one institution student retention increased by 10% with the program, at another critical thinking tests improved significantly, and at Phillips student perceptions on the key issues of the project regularly show positive gains after one year in the program. Leadership collapse and fragmented disciplinary cultures seemed to explain colleges and the state university that did not continue the project.

In small colleges the model, strategies and incentive grants of $10,000 will strengthen and produce more faculty and curricular integration or coherence.

Dr. Kenneth W. Shipps, Provost
Phillips University
Enid, Oklahoma 73701
405/237-4433
Title of Report: "Building Curricular Coherence Through The Teaching of Classic Texts at Eleven Colleges."

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project Title: Building Curricular Coherence Through The Teaching of Classic Texts at Eleven Colleges

Grantee Organization and Address:
Phillips University
P. O. Box 2000, University Station
Enid, Oklahoma 73702

Name of Project Director:
Dr. Kenneth W. Shipps, Academic Vice President

Telephone Number: 405/237-4433

A. Project Overview

Phillips University proposed to engage at least one hundred thirty faculty of ten colleges in the United States with a collaborative faculty and curricular development project using classical texts. The large, national purposes behind the project centered on national concerns about the content, coherence and effective teaching of the college curricula, especially in foundational or general studies courses. The Phillips faculty had addressed each of these concerns in a two year FIPSE project from January 1, 1986 to December 31, 1988. In that project faculty had followed certain strategies which it believed were fairly successful in addressing these national problems. That faculty believed their strategies might be transferred with similar success to other institutions. With funds severed for the project in 1989 they sought ten other institutions who would agree to explore the value of classic texts as important common content for the curriculum; to have discussions of those texts among faculty, led by a master teacher; and to see if this dialogue would lead to new curricular agreements. These strategies had worked at Phillips. Phillips first sought and obtained the cooperation of two neighboring institutions, Bethel and McPherson in Kansas, who had expressed deep interest in the Phillips model and strategies. In the first year of the project these colleges became test cases for expanding the Phillips model. Then with some initial success in the transfer test, faculty at Phillips, Bethel and McPherson sought eight other institutions to replicate the strategies. After a national search the project leaders selected eight other institutions, largely small liberal arts colleges. These colleges pursued the key strategies and completed project activities between 1990 and 1991.

Most of the results centered on faculty and curricular development. Over two hundred faculty participated in the project at eleven colleges and universities. Faculty in survey instruments reported the summer seminars created a community of interest in the key issues of using common classical texts, creating more focused agreement on common content, adapting

effective teaching strategies to teach classics, and creating a conversation among students and faculty on the relationship between courses in the general studies taken by most students. By the end of the project seven institutions had begun or were highly committed to the curricular model set forth by Phillips University.

B. Purpose

The Phillips project addressed the national problems of confusion and fragmentation in American undergraduate education. These problems arise from at least a threefold deficiency: a lack of truly important, agreed-upon content in the curriculum; the lack of clear interrelatedness in the minds of students and faculty from one course to another; the lack of effective teaching strategies to teach common content at the level of the learner. Phillips wanted to see if strategies it had developed during summer faculty development seminars, using premier classic texts introduced by master teachers, might attract and influence other college faculty as ways to strengthen coherence. Although Phillips attracted a national group of colleges to participate, the dominant interest in this project was from smaller liberal arts colleges.

C. Background and Origins

The Phillips project arose out of internal concerns that related to the aforementioned concerns (content, coherence, teaching) that were being discussed generally in higher education. When FIPSE proposed its guidelines in 1986, Phillips projected its strategies and received a two-year grant. Success in creating faculty conversations on classic texts, leading to discussions of the project's major concerns, made for great enthusiasm at Phillips. Faculty from other institutions who attended the six week summer seminars in 1987 and 1988, FIPSE representative Helene Scher, and Phillips faculty thought this project might be expanded and replicated to some degree at other colleges. So in 1989 Phillips applied for another FIPSE grant to expand the Phillips model. By the fall of 1989 eight colleges were selected to participate. They were:

Baker University
Illinois Benedictine College
Mount Mercy College
Mount Saint Mary College
Oklahoma State University
Presbyterian College
St. Andrews Presbyterian College
Roanoke College

With ten colleges participating, Phillips began to move into the main features of expanding the Phillips model.

D. Project Description

The key assumptions of the Phillips project were as follows. First, for a modest monetary incentive, a $10,000 grant, each college faculty was to propose and to initiate curricular discussions on how classic texts might be brought creatively into the general studies or core curricula of their colleges. Second, it was assumed that faculty reading classic texts in common, led by master teachers, would probably lead to both changes in faculty teaching the courses taught and possibly more conversations about achieving curricular coherence. With direction and liaisons from Phillips it was also assumed that the key objectives of curricular development could be pursued and well-coordinated. After a direct mail invitation to five hundred colleges nationally, Phillips did receive more than enough well-conceived proposals from interested institutions.

The institutions selected then pursued their somewhat independent curricular objectives, using the strategies of summer seminars focusing on classical texts, master teachers to introduce texts, teaching strategies and instructional materials. All colleges, including Phillips, conducted communal readings of at least three classic texts over three weeks in the summer of 1990. Before and afterwards Phillips and its external evaluator, Dr. William Pallet of Kansas State University, developed survey and interview materials to establish baseline data for follow-up evaluation. Then in the 1990/91 academic year the local coordinators and other interested faculty were to see how far curricular discussions and teaching applications could take place on each campus. The final activities in the summer of 1991 were a wrap-up conference where again a favorite master teacher, Dr. Barbara Walvoord, was to work on using classic texts especially in helping students apprehend their meaning and value. At the July meeting at Phillips in the summer of 1991 final evaluations and continuation plans were also discussed. Clearly most of the institutions had taken the project seriously, had reasonably good results on time consuming efforts to effect curricular change, and seven colleges were eager to continue the project on their own.

The primary activities and curricular pursuits of each college would be summarized as follows. At Baker University faculty pursued a three week summer seminar working on three texts (Plato's Republic, works by Marx, and Skinner's Walden Two) which all Baker students would encounter in an interdisciplinary course. At Illinois Benedictine College faculty introduced Plato's Republic, Mill's On Liberty and Freud's Civilization in two pilot freshmen courses, the Honors Program, and one part of the regular freshmen writing sequence. Faculty at Mount Mercy College proposed utopian texts (Plato's Republic, More's Utopia and others) as a way for several disciplines to find ways of including these texts and other future oriented ideas. In New York the faculty at Mount Saint Mary's College opened interdisciplinary discussions on Euripides, Toynbee and Melville for their general studies curricula. At Oklahoma State we saw a somewhat

different approach. All twelve members of the Sociology Department who are involved in the general education offerings for the University focused on the reading and teaching of texts by Marx, Weber, Durkheim and DeTocqueville. At Presbyterian College in Clinton, South Carolina classic texts were used for two curricular efforts: a Great Books Honors Seminar for sophomores and a faculty development program on the relevance of the great books. At St. Andrew's Presbyterian College in Laurinburg, North Carolina classic texts such as Aristotle's Physics and the Bhagavad Gita were the focus of seminars for general studies courses in "World Cultures." Finally, at Roanoke College Homer's Iliad, Dante's Divine Comedy and Rousseau's Emile would be at the heart of the college's new general core of seven courses spread across four years.

E. Project Results

Most of the results of this project centered on faculty and curricular development. Of the two hundred faculty who participated almost all reported the summer seminars created a community of interest in the key issues of the project: the use of classical texts as valuable, important living centerpieces for a curriculum, the creating of discussions and more agreement on common content, the awareness of and adoption of effective teaching strategies to teach classics, and discussions on the interrelatedness necessary in general studies. Also, by the end of the project seven institutions were highly committed to the curricular model set forth by Phillips, and the external evaluator thought that the strategies had generally worked well. There were even some interesting preliminary results related to students. McPherson's project seemed to aid student retention by ten percent. At Baker the academic dean reported a statistically significant improvement on a standardized critical thinking test after students had taken the classics sequence. And at Phillips, which continued its model throughout the grant, there were two noticeable results among students. First, survey evidence showed that students were catching on and liking the purposes and approaches in the Phillips-FIPSE concepts. Student perceptions on key issues improved significantly from year to year. Also, as one might expect, students also became very much more familiar with classic texts taught at Phillips as they passed from one year to the next.

F. Summary and Conclusions

After three years of following a model and strategies developed by Phillips University, it was clear that at least seven institutions could replicate essential objectives of the project. All ten institutions were able to obtain at least ten faculty to spend three weeks reading classic texts in common. Where it came to including the works in the curriculum and teaching them to students only seven institutions could move to this objective within the grant timeline. To the external evaluator, the seven

participating institutions who plan to continue, and Phillips leadership the project was a success. Not all the evaluative strategies proposed were appropriate and not all institutions were able to carry out their hopes, but the model clearly can be transferred at least among small colleges and universities. The guidelines of this project should give considerable promise to those who seek both more in effective strategies for teaching classic texts, more agreement on common content in general studies and more conversation and interaction toward achieving curricular integration or coherence.

G. Appendices

There are six appendices to the FIPSE final report. The first is the final report of the Phillips pilot project grant from September 1, 1986 - August 1, 1988. The second appendix provides a detailed summary of each curricular project at the eleven participating institutions during the project, 1988-1991. The third and fourth appendices are student and faculty surveys for the 1988-1991 periods. The fourth appendix contains materials for the final conference at Phillips, July 1991, of local coordinators. And the final item is Dr. William Pallett's Phillips-FIPSE final evaluation report on the project, completed in November 1991.

Final Report on Phillips University's FIPSE Project
Building Curricular Coherence Through the Teaching of Classic Texts at Eleven Colleges
September 1, 1988 - August 31, 1991

"While not every institution who participated in the Phillips FIPSE summer seminars will copy the Phillips curriculum, the seminars have been 100% effective in being a catalyst for the participating institutions, a catalyst that builds intellectual community and forces the right kind of educational questions. The process can be expected to lead to improved educational outcomes" - Dr. William Pallett, External Evaluator of the Phillips FIPSE project, Planning and Evaluation Services, Kansas State University.

"At both Bethel and McPherson I found faculty attentive, responsive, and interest... not different from the best of the colleges I normally visit -- the colleges where I return again and again, each time seeing for myself that the workshops result in changes" - Dr. Barbara Walvoord, Professor of English, University of Cincinnati, Master Teacher at Phillips - FIPSE Colleges and at the Summative Conference in July 1991.

Project Overview

Between September of 1988 and August of 1991 eleven colleges participated in a faculty and curricular development project using classical texts. The large purpose of the project centered on national concerns about the content coherence and effective teaching of college curricula. The aim of the project was first to identify ten institutions willing to pursue a model program on achieving curricular coherence, using classic texts, that Phillips University had created in a pilot FIPSE project from 1986 to 1987. It was assumed that given a very modest financial incentive of $10,000 that at least ten colleges would be willing to follow some features of the Phillips model. Key features were a faculty willing to propose and to initiate the reading of classic texts collectively in summer seminars led by Master Teachers; that faculty would also be willing then to discuss how those texts might be effectively taught at the level of today's student, and assess the value of classic texts as important common content for the curriculum; to have discussions of those texts among faculty, led by a master teacher; and to see whether the texts might be good touchstones for inclusion in the foundational general studies of the college's curricula. In the first year Phillips sought and obtained the cooperation of two colleges, Bethel and McPherson, in exploring features of the Phillips model. It turned out that of those two colleges McPherson seemed to benefit more than Bethel from the three year grant. In late 1989 faculties at Phillips, Bethel and McPherson sought eight other institutions to participate in the project. After a national search the project leaders selected eight other institutions, largely small liberal arts colleges who proposed well-

conceived faculty and curricular development projects similar to that found in the Phillips model. Then through the 1990 and 1991 academic years these colleges followed several key strategies and completed project activities. One key strategy was a three week faculty development seminar for ten faculty, using classic texts and master teachers to center the discussions. Master teachers were brought in to introduce the texts, successful teaching strategies and instructional materials. Faculty from Phillips, Bethel and McPherson served as liaisons and advisors in creating the seminars and through the whole project. Every institution completed this phase of the project and then went on to discuss how the classics might be incorporated in curricula of the ten colleges. Only one University, Oklahoma State, did not complete all the projects including the formal activities of evaluation required in the terms for participating in the FIPSE grant.

Most of the results centered on the faculty and curricula at participating institutions. Over two hundred faculty participated in the project at eleven colleges and universities. In evaluations of the results faculty most frequently cited the building of a community of interest in the issues of curricular coherence, using common texts, and effective teaching coming from the participation. Institutional representatives reported great satisfaction, far better than the goal of 75%, in the summer faculty development seminar experiences. The fact that ten institutions stayed with the project to the end also was a significant result. By the end seven of the ten institutions had begun or were highly committed to a curricular model similar to that currently in place at Phillips. Data collected at Phillips, Baker University, and McPherson caught the favorable eye of the project's external evaluator. At McPherson the progress of taking up the model began slowly but made "outstanding progress" by 1991, much greater than the evaluator had anticipated during his 1989 visit. Baker made the best strides in collecting survey data which will be a good baseline for computer collection in the future. Phillips itself has had the longest history with the strategies. It continues its faculty seminars which are still lively and has collected student and faculty survey data showing the positive impact of this project on its faculty, students and curricula. Clearly this project has, for very few dollars, effected major changes and strengthened both faculty and curricula at participating colleges.

Purpose

As originally conceived, the project led by Phillips University personnel aimed to involve ten other colleges in attacking three major problems in American undergraduate education: the lack of truly important agreed on content in the curriculum; the lack of clear interrelatedness of curricular content in the minds of students and faculty from one course to the next; the lack of effective teaching at the level of the learner. The Phillips faculty had addressed each of these concerns in a two year FIPSE project from January 1, 1986 to December 31, 1988. In that

project the faculty had followed strategies which it believed were fairly successful in addressing these national problems. The Phillips faculty believed these strategies might be transferred with similar success to other institutions. Therefore in 1989 Phillips faculty applied to FIPSE for funding to extend its project to ten other institutions of higher education. The aim was to find ten institutions who would agree to explore the value of classic texts as important common content for the curriculum, to have discussions of those texts among faculty, led by a master teacher, and then to see if this dialogue would lead to some new curricular agreements, using those classic texts, and then the adoption of relevant teaching or pedagogical approaches that would or could be brought effectively into the classroom.

Although we at Phillips think that the major national problems identified have not changed, and we think that the strategies employed are effective, clearly we could only model how to effect change with a certain kind of college. Although we began with the ambition of seeking a variety of colleges and universities who would see similar problems and follow some of the strategies at Phillips, we found only one state university that was interested enough to write a reasonable proposal. Throughout the grant period people at a few state universities have expressed interest in the relevant problems and how Phillips addressed them, either through the initial application process or subsequent letters of inquiry. Most of the interest, however, came from small liberal arts colleges. We believe that interest speaks volumes about the values and interests of smaller liberal arts colleges, but it also suggests that for those interested in such national problems that they should be addressed in different ways and in other kinds of institutions. In creating a broader more diverse group, it probably would have been wiser for the U.S. Department of Education to pair Phillips with one or two different kinds of institutions. A research university, a comprehensive college or university and possibly a more selective liberal arts college might have joined Phillips and thereby have contributed both more resources and attractiveness to the whole project. Places of somewhat similar outlooks on how to attack these national problems do exist. Brooklyn College in the CUNY system, Lewis Clark College, University of Dayton, St. John's College (Maryland) and the University of Virginia, as well as others, might well have been urged or invited to join this project at some level to increase the pool of applicants and the national significance of the project. As it turned out, points of comparison between larger, more diverse institutions and small liberal arts colleges in this project are probably possible, but aims and methods discussed in this project will need a broader cross section of institutions if they are to have wide applicability.

Another observation on attacking the problems of curricular incoherence in American higher education is relevant at this point. FIPSE has long recognized the national problems related to this project. Indeed, they were implied and stated directly over the last six years in FIPSE guidelines for application.

Recently, however, FIPSE has dropped this kind of curricular problem from its guidelines. In watching the kinds of projects actually funded by FIPSE and discussing the issues with FIPSE program officers, it appears that much of higher education has little interest in dealing with these issues. Is it because major interests are elsewhere, such as on financial survival, cultural diversity, or are the problems of this area so systemic and structural to higher education, because of faculty specialization, curricular turn protecting and other factors, that it will take more resources and different visions to make major changes? The seeming intractability of the systemic problems probably underlie the inability of both Phillips in its small project and FIPSE nationally in achieving more of an impact on curricular coherence. One can point to some definite successes in the Phillips projects, but replicating the model will require more focus, variety and resources than have heretofore been brought to bear in higher education.

Background and Origins

To pursue curricular coherence through the teaching of classical texts in the core curriculum, Phillips had obtained a two year FIPSE grant in 1986 (see Appendix A). Both the problems and strategies pursued in that pilot project provided the background and inspiration of the project described in this report.

To build a strong, focused content foundation in the general studies curriculum Phillips faculty turned to the introduction of a select number of classic texts. To achieve an interrelatedness among fields for a core curriculum and in the minds of students and faculty, it aimed to have as many core faculty and students as possible study and reinforce references to these texts. Faculty with the assistance of master teachers for each text would study a text a week in six weeks of seminars in the summers of 1987 and 1988, introducing those texts to students in the subsequent academic year. Faculty focused on six texts for the foundational freshman English course taken by all students (English 1114) in the summer of 1987 and then six additional texts with interdisciplinary core relevance in the summer of 1988. The third aspect of the project, engaging students at their level with classic texts, was to come along more slowly after the faculty development phase. It was not until the second summer (1988) of study together that faculty worked actively to bring about a more innovative teaching culture.

The Phillips project began in 1985 with faculty and administrative discussions on how to overcome problems noticed in the general education curriculum. An ad hoc committee on the Core Curriculum then proposed a voluntary reorientation of general education courses in order to mitigate their lack of focus, connectedness and accessibility of material to students. Central to this reorientation was the sense of introducing carefully chosen classic texts, all of them fundamental to the development of Western thought, and all of them embodying issues relevant to

several disciplines. Phillips was not in a situation where it wanted to restructure its whole curriculum; it conceived of a way to improve its content and performance without a massive effort at totally reforming the curriculum. It saw a need to focus in Western texts, but did not aim to rule out non-western traditions. In its refocusing it did not aim to adopt a "Great Books" curriculum but rather a clear focus that included "masterpieces." It also wanted to emphasize close reading and better teaching, but it did not have hopes of a major move to adopt a critical skills approach to education as found in Alverno College or elsewhere. Rather, its aims were more modest. They aimed to persuade faculty to consider new emphases on skills and techniques as they arose from joint studies with faculty colleagues and new sensitivity to students. Phillips wanted to keep its distributional general education program with much of the existing content, but it sought to improve or to "add value" and focus to its program. Without voluntary cooperation from a strong-minded faculty, the modest but long-lasting changes would not be possible. Rather than create turf wars or threats, this pragmatic approach would systematically enhance most of the curriculum.

So with somewhat limited goals on curricular modifications, a desire to increase faculty interaction on possible common texts for general education courses and the need to make sure students could be instructed effectively with any common content that emerged Phillips began to develop strategies to its ends. It turned out that by focusing on faculty development it could achieve most of its aims. Its strategy was to seek external financial support to have seminars where faculty would discuss classical texts led by master teachers. Faculty would then decide whether some of those texts might be included in general education courses. Phillips faculty in the summers of 1987 and 1988 spent six weeks studying classic texts together and by the second summer they had indeed decided to introduce half of those texts in the freshman English course taken by all students. Preliminary data suggested that students could be taught these texts effectively and faculty would refer to these texts in other general education courses taught later in the students' college career. Faculty at Phillips also began to introduce classic texts into other courses into the core/general studies curriculum. Thus the agreed-on content could be introduced and effective teaching of classic texts could take place. By the end of the second year of the pilot study at Phillips, with encouragement from faculty observing from other colleges, the Phillips faculty decided to see if similar approaches might be useful to other colleges.

With internal commitment, support from evaluators, and interest expressed by other academic observers, Phillips faculty and administration decided to seek expansion of its project to at least ten other institutions. They believed that by refining their project through further collaborative study, offering ideas and some financial incentives to institutions with similar interests that they could create more focus in the curriculum and somewhat more effective teaching. They wanted to apply certain

lessons learned as they projected the inclusion of several other institutions. These lessons included the need of financial incentives for faculty to study together and allowance of enough time for faculty to work together in order to reach new levels of communication and in order to pose change possibilities. They also realized that master teachers were crucial because they would both draw interest in and respect for the value of the classics. These teachers would also model, if not directly state, effective teaching strategies. People at Phillips also realized that they must allow for different curricular interests so they planned an application procedure that would allow for institutional self definition of curricular problems and ownership of text selection. They also would permit some organizational differences and approaches beyond the summer seminar faculty development model. They therefore thought the expansion to other institutions should have certain fundamental approaches but would remain open to different concerns and advice, rather than prescription, from Phillips.

With all these considerations in mind Phillips applied for its second FIPSE grant in the spring of 1988. As we shall see, with considerable self-definition left to institutions some weaknesses would occur in the project, but given the size of resources available to Phillips internally and the external funding possibilities from FIPSE, a larger project would have been impossible. We at Phillips also realized the need for more formidable evaluation methods than we were able to muster. Thus we engaged Dr. William Pallett of Kansas State's Academic Evaluative Office to be part of the project. We expected more perceptive help than we received from FIPSE on evaluation, but we learned much along the way about evaluation. More advice from external sources on evaluation would have helped at the beginning of the project.

With funding from FIPSE, the project to involve ten colleges started slowly. The primary task of the project at the beginning was the identification of ten institutional participants beyond Phillips. As originally proposed, it had already identified two interested colleges in nearby Kansas, Bethel and McPherson, to cooperate in the first year. They were to be test cases in extending the Phillips model. In the first year these two colleges did recognize the same problems in curricular focus, lack of faculty conversations on curriculum, and teaching at the level of the learner. The method of faculty seminars directed by master teachers worked well for both institutions, and the amount of incentive funds were sufficient to attract faculty interest. Thus with test case for expansion working out well, Phillips began the most difficult phase of originating the project, interesting and involving another eight institutions. Phillips, McPherson, and Bethel were to continue in their initiatives on curricular dialogue, but most importantly they worked together in order to recruit and to choose eight more institutional participants for the second and third years of the grant. We invited applicants by direct mail from five hundred institutions, some regional universities, but mostly independent liberal arts col-

leges across the nation. Although we had interest from major universities in the region, for instance, the University of Oklahoma, the University of Tulsa, and some major institutions elsewhere in the country, such as Emory University and Pepperdine University, our best applications came from small liberal arts colleges and one State university. By the fall of 1989 we selected eight more colleges to participate. They were Baker University (Kansas), Illinois Benedictine College, Mount Mercy College (Iowa), Mount Saint Mary College (New York), Oklahoma State University, Presbyterian College (South Carolina), Roanoke College (Virginia), and St. Andrews Presbyterian College (North Carolina). With ten colleges participating, Phillips began to move into the main features of expanding this Phillips model.

Project Description

The key assumption of the Phillips project was: given a very modest incentive, a $10,0000 grant, at least ten college faculties would be willing to propose and to initiate curricular discussions on how classic texts might be brought creatively into the general studies or core curriculum of their colleges. Essentially, the assumptions also included the idea that faculty development would probably lead to both changes in faculty teaching and the courses taught, if not broader curricular change. And it was assumed that enough faculty from Phillips, McPherson and Bethel would be willing to advise the partnering institutions at crucial stages. Indeed, it was assumed that faculties already committed at Phillips, McPherson and Bethel would be able to give advice on how to create the summer seminars, from the choice of texts to master teachers, to providing continuous leadership as each of the originating campuses attempted to sustain and refine its own curricular development. It was further assumed that Phillips, McPherson and Bethel would probably make more progress than others in achieving curricular and pedagogical goals. And finally it was assumed that by certain qualitative and objective measures we could assess the success of the entire project. As conceived, then, faculty development would lead to curricular development with an impact on at least a hundred faculty and thousands of students. Phillips would manage the project and other faculties would initiate their own curricular discussions as far as possible in two years. It is clear from what follows that most of the key assumptions were correct, and as the results will show, the project met most of its objectives.

Before citing the project activities at other institutions, it would be important to suggest what Phillips attempted to achieve internally during this three year grant. After all Phillips had begun this process of curricular reform in 1986 and had aimed to continue its work to institutionalizing the use of classic texts for achieving curricular coherence. Faculty at Phillips did continue their collaborative studies of classic texts throughout the three year grant period. At least ten faculty studied together on at least two classic texts for at least two weeks in the summers of 1989, 1990, and 1991. The

basic texts introduced first in 1987 in the freshman English course, English 1114, have continued to be taught through the 1991/92 academic year. Most of the texts studied over the last five years have ended up as required in one or more general education courses. A whole series of other discussions and activities have taken place on campus to reinforce the basic directions begun in the first grant. For example, plays and lectures to the entire campus have followed themes or texts introduced in the FIPSE seminars. Discussions of texts have taken place on certain texts, such as Dante's Commedia and Bach's "B Minor Mass," in regular Wednesday luncheon gatherings of faculty. Texts in non-western classics have been studied as the University opened a branch campus in Japan, creating the likelihood of faculty exchange between the campuses on the FIPSE project. The whole focus on teaching that resulted from the FIPSE project has continued to add fresh topics and approaches to the major priority of teaching and learning at Phillips. In the minds of the faculty, pursuing coherence, faculty development, improving the teaching aspects of faculty work are now clearly part of the campus ethos. The FIPSE project has institutionalized much more than the teaching of classic texts. By assisting other institutions the Phillips faculty have gained values of leadership and ownership not previously in existence.

To highlight briefly the activities at Phillips over the last three years, we will focus on the summer seminars. In the summer of 1989 the faculty studied Aristotle's Ethics and Picasso's "Guernica." By the end of the grant period three of the Phillips core faculty were teaching the "Guernica" whereas previously they had not. Two faculty were likewise able to begin teaching Aristotle's Ethics. In 1990 the faculty began its emphasis on non-Western classics, studying the Bhagavad Gita and Shikibu's Japanese classic The Tale of Genji. In 1991 the non-western emphasis continued with Abe's Woman of the Dunes and concluded with Thomas More's Utopia. In faculty formal evaluations and interviews the reaction continues to be positive. The comments that follow are most typical: "Read books I never would have read;" "I'm constantly infusing my lectures with references to these works, even beyond the Western culture;" "spinoffs on this project are incredible - we must keep talking." The teaching impact, particularly in the variety of writing assignments, also receives frequent comment. Yet for this grant's period as much of the Phillips faculty involvement in this project was off-campus, it was managerial and associated with other participating institutions. But clearly the impact has continued internally. In the fall of 1991, as the faculty began a review of the general education curriculum at Phillips, they have continued to stress how they might extend the values and content of the FIPSE program. By necessity much of the faculty involvement from Phillips involved evaluative activities, which will be discussed later in the "Results" section of this report, nevertheless, with very little financial incentive coming from federal funds the faculty at Phillips kept a lively pace over the last three years, further creating a special FIPSE ethos on campus. True institutionalization of this program has taken place.

During the summer of 1990, after selection of eight other institutions in the fall of 1989, faculty at these colleges followed the Phillips strategies (St. Andrew's Presbyterian sent its faculty contingent off campus for study in the winter of 1990/91). The key strategy was a faculty development seminar for at least ten faculty held in the summer of 1990, using a classic text as the center of discussion. Master teachers were to be brought into introduce the texts, teaching strategies and instructional materials. Each campus had a Phillips, McPherson or Bethel faculty mentor to lay the groundwork and to visit during some portion of the summer seminar. All colleges conducted communal readings of at least three classic texts over three weeks. For example, at Baker University the faculty studied Plato's Republic, works by Marx and Skinner's Walden Two. Works by Aristotle, Homer, Dante, Rousseau, Melville, DeTocqueville, Mill, Weber, Durkheim and Freud were among the texts studied across these ten institutions. Then in the final strategy faculty talked about the most effective ways of teaching these texts. They analyzed ideas and models presented by master teachers but also exchanged how they individually might work on the texts or themes in a classroom setting. In most cases the partner institutions discussed how more coherence could result from incorporating these texts at some point in their own curricula.

To elaborate activities we will need to describe the focus at each campus (see Appendix B). At Baker University faculty pursued a three week summer seminar working on three texts (Plato's Republic, works by Marx, and Skinner's Walden Two) which all Baker students would encounter in an interdisciplinary course. At Illinois Benedictine College faculty introduced Plato's Republic, Mill's On Liberty and Freud's Civilization in two pilot freshmen courses, the Honors Program, and one part of the regular freshmen writing sequence. Faculty at Mount Mercy College proposed utopian texts (Plato's Republic, More's Utopia and others) as a way for several disciplines to find ways of including these texts and other future oriented ideas. In New York the faculty at Mount Saint Mary's College opened interdisciplinary discussions on Euripides, Toynbee and Melville for their general studies curricula. At Oklahoma State we saw a somewhat different approach. All twelve members of the Sociology Department who are involved in the general education offerings for the University focused on the reading and teaching of texts by Marx, Weber, Durkheim and DeTocqueville. At Presbyterian College in Clinton, South Carolina classic texts were used for two curricular efforts: a Great Books Honors Seminar for sophomores and a faculty development program on the relevance of the great books. At St. Andrew's Presbyterian College in Laurinburg, North Carolina classic texts such as Aristotle's Physics and the Bhagavad Gita were the focus of seminars for general studies courses in "World Cultures." Finally, at Roanoke College Homer's Iliad, Dante's Divine Comedy and Rousseau's Emile would be at the heart of the college's new general core of seven courses spread across four years.

Part of activities at each campus also involved establishing

baseline data for future evaluative comparison. Faculty were to be interviewed on their reactions by up to three people: the local coordinator, the external evaluator and a faculty liaison from Phillips, Bethel and McPherson. Campus liaisons were to check on how favorable faculty were to the three week study sessions on classic texts. Also they were to see what survey results could be obtained before the seminar and whether faculty had discussed how the classic texts could be taught in various disciplines and especially in the general studies curriculum. People at Phillips and William Pallett, the external evaluator, had prepared survey questionnaires for both faculty and students to establish baseline data (see Appendices C, D). After feedback from most of the participating institutions, modifications were made. In 1990 most of the institutions were to administer the surveys and send the results to Dr. Pallett for tabulation. Most of the institutions complied with the requests, and data from institutions came in properly formatted for computer tabulation, but some of the crucial demographic data was sometimes missing and different student sectors were tabulated at participating colleges, so the survey had basic problems if used for comparative purposes. Indeed it soon appeared that institutions were at such different junctures in their process of adopting classical texts for curricular coherence that the immediate usefulness of data for cross-institutional comparison seemed very problematic to Dr. Pallett and the project's Director, Dr. Shipps. During the spring of 1991 the leaders of the project decided to hold off in using survey data and to rely on the participant observation data which was also being collected for evaluation.

By the spring of 1991 all institutions except Oklahoma State had submitted progress reports to Dr. Pallett and Dr. Shipps. Clearly most institutions were making progress at some level. The final, required activity was a wrap-up conference involving campus coordinators at Phillips in summer of 1991. Some colleges were planning to continue summer seminars on their own funds in the summer of 1991, as did Phillips. For the summertime conference at Phillips, faculty coordinators were to read classic texts, have a community reading of the texts led by Master Teacher Dr. Barbara Walvoord. Walvoord was also assigned workshop topics on how the faculty could help students in their understanding of texts, inviting student discussion and responding to student writing. Then Dr. Walvoord and the group would make suggestions on how to continue the project on each campus, and then a final reporting session would take place with Dr. Pallett on results and plans for continuation (see Appendix E). All of these activities were well attended and well-received by coordinators during the last week of July, 1991, at Phillips. These activities concluded the formal activities of the project except for the financial accounting for the nearly $10,000 expended by each participating college. Conversations among participating institutions will continue over the months and years ahead, some of which will be added to the FIPSE file on this project, but now we must turn from activities during the project to the main results of this complex project.

Project Results

The primary results anticipated in this project were to be in the areas of faculty and curricular development (see Pallett's evaluation, Appendix F). Although we have good data to show how students responded at two campuses (Phillips and Baker), this kind of evaluative data was not the primary objective of the grant. Also, whereas we were able to devise surveys that could apply and be compared among faculties, the surveys for students ran into several problems, to be described later. Of the results to be reported we will begin with faculty development, especially as recognized by a survey instrument used to detect pre- and post-workshop reaction and then the reactions by faculty interviewed by Dr. Pallett. We originally had proposed to use a nationally normed Council of Independent Colleges instrument, but we later discovered inadequacies in that instrument. After looking at faculty development, we will focus on curricular development, noticing the number of institutions that introduced classic texts into core curricula as a result of exposure in the faculty summer seminars. As explained in previous reports we dropped our planned measurement from ACT testing; the ACT instrument on general education development was not precise enough to catch what the partners were attempting to do. Next in this section on results we will report on survey data that some colleges collected on student reaction. Specifically, we will note for data collected at Baker and Phillips. Finally, we will indicate some general results that were valuable but not anticipated.

Primary objectives with regard to the faculty development aspects were the involvement of at least one hundred thirty faculty at eleven institutions in the study of classic texts in three week summer seminars, and then at least a 75% overall satisfaction with the seminar experience. We were able to achieve the involvement of eleven institutions, all of which had at least one three week summer seminar. Actually more than two hundred faculty participated with different people taking part in various sessions of each college's three week program, the three summer seminars at Phillips, two seminars at McPherson and Bethel, as well as the second summer seminars at three other colleges in 1991. In post workshop surveys over 90% of our faculty found the summer seminars were worthwhile experiences. After the summer seminars fewer faculty were skeptical about the value of classic texts as foundational to the curriculum and as works teachable to today's students. As compared with faculty sentiment at Phillips back in 1986, faculty were somewhat less supportive of classics being added to the core. As Dr. Pallett conducted interviews and as faculty liaisons from Phillips, McPherson and Bethel spoke to participating faculty, most thought the seminars on classical texts were very effective in raising the right kind of educational questions to focus on curricular coherence and how successful teaching of texts could take place.

An even more difficult objective of the project related to

curricular change. The Phillips project aimed to have at least seven institutions reach some stage of integrating the Phillips model on coherence (use of classical text content, inclusion and references to these classics in the general studies, and relevant, effective pedagogy). Fortunately, on this objective some colleges already had an orientation or existing curricula using classical texts (Baker, St. Andrew's Presbyterian, and Roanoke). All three of these institutions added texts studied in the Phillips-FIPSE project to their core. Faculty and administration all reported how this project increased coherence in their curricula. McPherson spent two years formulating their approach and by the 1990/91 academic year could report the introduction of two classic texts into a new credit bearing Freshman orientation program. Due to the tragic death of the FIPSE coordinator at Illinois Benedictine, the resignation of two key faculty supporters, a sabbatical leave to another proponent, the Illinois Benedictine momentum slowed, but one non-core course using the texts studied on this project was taught in the fall semester of 1991/92, and the strategic three year plan for curricular change at IBC has integration of classic texts in the required curriculum. Mount St. Mary has also taken time to develop faculty approval for integrating classic texts into their core curriculum, but their bidisciplinary approach will produce four courses over 1991/92. Institutional representatives credit the Phillips-FIPSE program for the Mount St. Mary curricular change. Some features of the classics studied with FIPSE funds have entered the curriculum at Presbyterian College. Their study of Newton and Darwin were topics in one-credit honors courses for sophomores and juniors. The Phillips-FIPSE concept will be followed in future fall and summer seminars at Presbyterian College, but it is too soon to know whether this "classics" approach will move deeply into the Presbyterian core curriculum. Nevertheless, with the sympathetic faculty and administrative leadership at Presbyterian it is likely that this college will become the seventh college to accept features of the Phillips model. Although these seven institutions were self-selective in their interest in pursuing the Phillips model, it is clear that this kind of project can boost and direct curricular change over a very short time span.

It is also clear that not every institution that seriously explores curricular change possibilities will end up with a model similar to that at a modeling institution. Although Oklahoma State faculty in the Sociology Department found value meeting together to do common readings for works in the OSU general studies curriculum, the common effort fell apart when the Chair went on sabbatical and everyone returned to their separate research interests. Faculty raved at their one common intellectual endeavor in years during the FIPSE summer seminar, but the community ethos appeared to be so individualistic and leadership so lacking that permanent curricular change seemed remote. The same problem of leadership collapse occurred at Bethel. As Bill Pallett notes in his Evaluative Report (Appendix F), "the President and Dean of the college both supported a classic text general education component but both have left the college." Even with firm leadership the problem of common cause and coherence

flies against, as Pallett correctly notes, "the institution's disciplinary history and culture." And if one followed the developments at Mt. Mercy in Iowa, particularly as Dr. John Boots observed from his visit in 1990 through 1991, the separatist, disciplinary culture remained strong even with the useful summer seminars. Institutions with strong individualistic and/or research orientations such as OSU, Bethel or Mt. Mercy will be more difficult environments for this kind of project. Not having visited these institutions before accepting their proposals to be in the project, it would have been difficult to know the limited possibilities for an ambitious curricular development project. But as Dr. Pallett astutely observed, "the implementation of a new curriculum, or even slight modification of an old one, is a sensitive, complex and time consuming activity . . . Given these difficulties, the outcomes of the Phillips-FIPSE seminars have to be viewed as positive."

Now we must move beyond faculty and curricular development to results among students. First, at McPherson as Dr. Pallett reports (Appendix F), the Academic Dean at McPherson credits improved instructional ratings and significant retention of freshmen to the Phillips integrating model. The dean's citing of a nine percent increase in retention is not necessarily traceable to this program, but they are truly outstanding numbers. An institution can normally expect no more than a ten per cent increase in retention by programmatic efforts, so if this program has so dramatically increased retention in just one year, it truly is worth further work on many campuses. Another positive result with reactions occurred at Baker University. There, as Pallett reports, student reaction to the new classic text curriculum improved from initial baseline attitudinal survey data as compared with the same group surveyed a year later after the classic text curricular experience. Baker's dean also reported statistically significant improvement in the Ennis-Weir test of critical thinking after students took the classics sequence. In data collected by Phillips, statistical differences from baseline data exist in two surveys, one the standardized ACT survey on student attitudes and the student survey developed for the FIPSE project by Dr. Shipps and Dr. Pallett (See Appendix C). On the ACT survey the only statistical difference occurred between 1988 and 1990 on one of three questions that "could be" related to the FIPSE-Phillips project. The question relates to "how much the student had gained in acquaintance and enjoyment of literature." The numbers reporting "very much" or "quite a lot" were as follows: 1988 the percentage was 49% (151 of 308) whereas in 1990 the percentage was 58.5% (120 of 205). All kinds of variables could be influencing this change, and thus Dr. Pallett and Dr. Shipps early on determined not to use any of the existing nationally standardized tests for this specific project.

In the fall of 1990, thirty-nine students filled out a FIPSE student survey developed by Dr. Shipps and Dr. Bill Pallett (see Appendix C). In order to ascertain if student attitudes had changed after a year, these students were identified and resurveyed. Of the thirty-nine, twenty-three were still on campus in

the fall of 1991. Of these twenty-three, twenty filled out the same survey in 1991. The profile of the 1991 survey group closely mapped that of the original thirty-nine. The following discussion is a reflection of these twenty students' experience with core courses as well s a self-evaluation on academic progress.

The questions gaining more than a 20% increase from year to year in "strongly agree" and "agree" include the following:

"I prefer a curriculum where from one class to the next, I encounter the same great works from different perspectives."

"The teachers in my core or general studies curriculum classes taught at a level I could understand.

"Courses in my general education experience seem to demand more knowledge and understanding as I progress from year to year."

The only question decreasing more than five percent in the "agree" or "strongly agree" responses was "I am not intimidated by reading lengthy and difficult works." The follow-up survey reflected that 15% more of the sample were intimidated.

In the negative phrasing, gaining 30% in the combination of the "disagree" and "strongly disagree" categories was "There are too many core curriculum required courses, therefore, I don't have the opportunity to take courses I really want to take."

Several statements received either 95% or 100% of the students strongly agreeing or agreeing in both years of the survey. These are:

"Teachers in my core or general studies curriculum classes taught at a level I could understand."

"My core curriculum required courses are valuable part of my educational experience."

And 95% in the same vein "disagree" or "strongly disagree" that "Taking general education classes does <u>not</u> help me learn what I want to learn."

Raising the most intense feeling in 1991, 50% of the students agreed <u>strongly</u> with "I believe there are advantages to students studying the same work in a number of different disciplines like studying Freud in both English and Psychology" (up from 20%). Sixty-five percent <u>strongly</u> disagree with "I don't understand why I'm required to read old books" (55% in 1990).

In the personal progress section in 1991, 70% of the students responded "very much" to "ability to put ideas together to see relationships, similarities and differences between ideas." In 1990 only 35% had reported the same response. In contrast to a 75% figure in 1990, in 1991 100% reported "very much" or "quite

a bit" when responding to "Gaining a broad general education about different fields of knowledge, and ability to put ideas together to see relationships, similarities and differences between ideas."

Thus it would appear that in student attitudes, at least at Phillips, the students were catching on and liking the purposes and approaches in the Phillips-FIPSE concepts as they stayed in the Phillips environment. It is also clear in the same survey that students were very much more familiar with classic texts after taking the survey in 1990 and again in 1991. On average, between the two years students were twice as familiar in 1991 with the listed FIPSE texts used at Phillips program as they were 1990. Although these surveys have some limitations and the sample is small, it appears that fairly objective data collected at Phillips shows both recognition and positive value for the FIPSE program among students.

Finally, as always, there are unexpected or unplanned results on these kinds of projects. First, at Phillips it is quite remarkable that faculty had the staying power to carry on this project without faltering for over five years. They achieved ownership, confidence, and considerable prestige in circles outside their normal pursuits. Virtually no acrimony developed during any part of the project. Considerable resistance still exists among faculty about setting up a "canon" of classics and then forcing all students to buy that "canon." In surveys conducted on using and requiring FIPSE works in classes, those who require and use these classics in their classes are precisely those who have taken part in FIPSE seminars and other activities. Of special note also is how these kinds of projects can evolve with change of leadership, faculty leaving and new directions at an institution. It appears if the faculty leadership stays committed the project, it will take a life of its own. At Phillips we have done considerable work on a Japanese branch campus and foreseeing the need for a broader view of classics faculty have been introduced non-Western classics. It is likely that participating colleges will see similar modifications if they are open to change and have committed themselves deeply to the program. Finally, it was curious to see how all the objective type measures that we attempted to use could not be fit into this project at least with its funded time limits. As Dr. Pallett notes, "the intentions to do survey research were well intended." Some baseline data became available and more will come as plans for continuation proceed, but we were forced back largely to qualitative evaluation by participant observation, supported by a modicum of objective type survey data. Phillips for its part will continue to supply FIPSE's file with student outcomes data. And it will seek the cooperation of the seven colleges that are proceeding with the project.

As implied by the last observations, at least seven colleges plan to continue this project. Dr. Pallett's report suggests the kind of curricular form that each institution will follow. Each institution will be responsible for its own faculty development

groups and curricular activities. Phillips will stay in touch with local project coordinators and press them to report student outcomes data. As for Phillips itself, there are several ideas on how to continue the "FIPSE" program. Some argue for features of this project in a one hour freshman seminar - this is likely to pass faculty senate within a year. Others want to continue the summer seminars after a year's hiatus, using innovative instruction funds from the University's budget. Other faculty are talking about seeking an NEH grant, taking the concepts in the direction of a cross-cultural study with faculty from Phillips University Japan. The idea of seeking further grants was also quite prominent at the concluding conference (July 1991) of local coordinators of the seven institutions who plan to continue the project. And the general conclusion at that conference was that each institution will disseminate the Phillips-FIPSE concepts in their own ways on their own campuses.

Summary and Conclusions

After three years of following very specific strategies, Phillips University was able to transfer its approaches on curricular and faculty development to seven other institutions. Holding out a modest $10,000 incentive to participate, Phillips was able to select ten institutions who would have at least ten faculty read classic texts in common, discuss how they might be taught effectively and then consider if some of those texts might be common touchstones for inclusion in the foundational courses or general studies in the curriculum. Over two hundred faculty participated in the project and thirty master teachers led summer seminars introducing the classic works and how to teach them effectively. Although it is often difficult to obtain agreement among faculty, especially across academic disciplines, the tactic of summer seminars and master teachers worked well. All ten colleges participated in this part of the project. When it came to including classic works in the curriculum, only seven institutions could point to some success by the end of the grant period. Although evaluation was one of the weaker components in the program, interviews and participant observation results clearly gave favorable ratings both to the strategies and the curricular ideas implied in the project; again they were: creating a more focused, important agreed-on content in the general education of students; adapting effective teaching strategies to teach classics; and creating a conversation among students and faculty on the relationship between courses in at least the general studies common to most students - in other words, achieving more coherence in the curriculum.

In conclusion, it is with considerable pleasure that we conclude this project. Lots of people know it was a success. It was slower in developing its curricular impact than Dr. Pallett and others anticipated, but it achieved its major objectives. It is not likely to create a major sensation because it was a small scale project and most educational heavyweights are on to different topics or have given up on curricular coherence. Yet if a small university can devise strategies and successfully create

some curricular change and coherence in a vast sea of curricular chaos, then some hope exists for better results if other, larger places would simply make the effort. Considerable praise must go to the dedicated faculty and master teachers who have effectively worked on this project. Although FIPSE input was limited, it was encouraging from the advice of Helene Scher and Jaymie Lewis, program officers, to the personal interest of FIPSE's Director, Charles Karelis. After more than six years of planning and implementing of this work, there is a sense of exhaustion, but exhilaration prevails. Though it will not always work, the model of this project will be successful in many colleges and universities.

Appendices

A. Final report on Phillips University FIPSE Project, September 1, 1986 - August 1, 1988.

B. Project Descriptions of the College and University Participants in the Phillips/FIPSE Project on Faculty and Curricular Coherence, 1988-1991.

C. Student survey for FIPSE Project.

D. Faculty survey for FIPSE Project.

E. Wrap-up conference materials, local coordinators at Phillips, July, 1991.

F. William Pallett's Phillips-FIPSE evaluation report, November, 1991.

APPENDIX A

Final report on Phillips University FIPSE Project,
September 1, 1986 - August 1, 1988.

APPENDIX A

Final Report on Phillips University's FIPSE Project: Achieving Curricular Coherence through the Teaching of Classic Texts, September 1, 1986 - August 31, 1988

"This is the best and most important program for faculty development by far in my twenty-five years at Phillips" - Dr. Robert Simpson, Phillips University

"You are certainly creating coherence in the curriculum of the college, the kind of coherence we all need. Things cohere because faculty is learner focused and because it is able to combine concern about core content with an active interest in the teaching/learning process. . .That group of (Phillips) faculty shares more than common texts; they share a common vision of liberal education." - Dr. Larry Grimes, English Professor and Department Head at Bethany College (WV), after a visit to the 1988 Phillips FIPSE summer seminar.

Project Overview

The Phillips project on curricular coherence began in 1985 with brainstorming by a few faculty and the academic dean on how to deal with several problems: lack of focus and important, agreed-on content for a core curriculum; lack of clear interrelatedness of subject matter in the minds of students and faculty; lack of effective teaching at the level of the learner. By early in 1986, the Phillips faculty agreed to pursue a project that did not alter the structure of required courses in general education but would consider changes in the content. The English faculty agreed to consider a revised reading list for the freshman English course required of all students. Other faculty agreed to study the classic texts to be used and to refer to those texts in their general education courses. With funding from FIPSE most of the Phillips general studies faculty studied classic texts for freshman English in the summer of 1987 and went on to study several more classic texts for Phillips general education courses in the summer of 1988. Through a variety of means in addition to summer seminars with master teachers or classic texts, the faculty adopted and referred to these classic texts in most general education courses; thereby they have facilitated a more coherent general education at Phillips. Almost all (25) of the general studies faculty have participated; eighteen include at least one classic text as part of the course content in the general education courses that they teach; hundreds (c.400) of students have already both appreciated and grasped this new approach for achieving a core curriculum. Beyond these local results, forty faculty from other colleges have observed the project. Several have expressed an interest in making similar changes in their own colleges, and FIPSE has agreed to fund at least ten other colleges who follow a similar attempt at curricular reform and coherence. These developments will certainly give both national visibility and impact to the Phillips project in American higher education.

Purpose

As originally conceived Phillips planned to attack a three-sided problem commonly found in American higher education: lack of focused, important and agreed-on content in the core curriculum; lack of interrelatedness of subject matter in the minds of students and faculty; lack of effective teaching of

general education courses at the level of the learner. To build a strong, focused content foundation in the general studies curriculum Phillips faculty turned to the introduction of a select number of classic texts. To achieve an interrelatedness among fields for a core curriculum and in the minds of students and faculty, it aimed to have as many core faculty and students as possible study and reinforce references to these texts. Faculty with the assistance of master teachers for each text would study a text a week in six weeks of seminars in the summers of 1987 and 1988, introducing those texts to students in the subsequent academic year. Faculty focused on six texts for the foundational freshman English course taken by all students (English 1114) in the summer of 1987 and then six additional texts with interdisciplinary core relevance in the summer of 1988. The third aspect of the project, engaging students at their level with classic texts, is coming along but not as rapidly as the faculty development phase. It was not until the second summer (1988) of study together that faculty worked actively to bring about a more innovative teaching culture.

The only other weakness in the original strategy was an unanticipated slowness in achieving cross-disciplinary dialogue during the academic year. Planners predicted resistance and the falling into habitual patterns. They therefore planned the summer seminars. Not as many joint projects as hoped developed during the teaching semesters. Part of the explanation comes from difficulties in breaking natural patterns of faculty and part was peculiar to Phillips, which suffered severe financial stress and a leadership crisis in the 1987/88 academic year. More joint activities did develop in the fall of 1988, but demands from new presidential leadership and a reaccreditation self-study also sapped energies. A momentum for this reform has developed, however, especially with the new goal of spreading the reform to ten other collees through a second FIPSE grant which came through in the summer of 1988. And for just a two year program, every observer has marvelled at the basic success of the faculty and curricular developments. Internally the faculty have genuinely appreciated the community and coherence achieved. There is considerable enthusiasm to continue the project and to broaden the impact.

Background and Origins

The Phillips project began in 1985 with faculty and administrative discussions on how to overcome problems noticed in the general education curriculum. An ad hoc Committee on the Core Curriculum then proposed a voluntary reorientation of general education courses in order to mitigate their lack of focus, connectedness and accessibility of material to students. Central to this reorientation was the sense of introducing carefully chosen classic texts, all of them fundamental to the development of Western Thought, and all of them embodying issues relevant to several disciplines. Phillips was not in a situation where it wanted to restructure its whole curriculum; it conceived of a way to improve its content and performance without a massive effort at totally reforming the curriculum. It saw a need to focus in Western texts, but did not aim to rule out non-western traditions. In its refocusing it did not aim to adopt a "Great Books" curriculum but rather a clear focus that included "masterpieces." It also wanted to emphasize close reading and better teaching, but it did not have hopes of a major move to adopt a critical skills approach to education as found in Alverno College or elsewhere. Rather, its aims were more modest. They aimed to persuade faculty to consider new emphases on skills and techniques as they arose from joint studies with faculty colleagues and new sensitivity to students. Phillips wanted to keep its distributional general education program with much of the existing content, but it sought to improve or to "add value" and focus to its program. Without voluntary cooperation from a

strong-minded faculty, the modest but long-lasting changes would not be possible. Rather than create turf wars or threats, this pragmatic approach would systematically enhance all parts of the program.

Initially Phillips had only a few faculty interested in this idea. In a Council of Independent Colleges survey at Phillips in the fall of 1986, only one person out of sixty faculty at Phillips saw "improvements" in pedagogy and curriculum worth their time. Two or three interdisciplinary courses had been offered in the previous ten years, but virtually no one saw value in a joint program as prepared in the FIPSE proposal during the winter of the 1986/87 academic year. Without funding and the informal approach of being paid to read and to think about curriculum and teaching, Phillips faculty probably would not have apprehended the potential benefits of trying the project. Planners realized the fragmentation in general studies curriculum, lack of community, specialization, and other interests that prevented such a cooperative effort. They became aware of problems in curricular fragmentation nationally by various reports at the time of preparing the FIPSE proposal. Thus they mentioned that their project might prove helpful in overcoming major problems nationally. As it turned out, recognition of internal problems and ideas for solutions, which were paramount in the proposal, actually fit a much larger context and may be extremely helpful with national problems.

Project Description

The key strategy assumptions for the Phillips approach involved faculty development seminars held over two summers, 1987 and 1988. The task was to have faculty choose classic texts and master teacher/scholars to introduce them each week, and then see if improved teaching strategies, instructional materials and dialogue on improvement of general education would ensue. Internally in the 1986/87 academic year an Advisory Committee pursued faculty interests in agreed on texts for the first summer, obtained master teachers, and set up the format for summer study. It obviously involved considerable faculty freedom, cooperation and risk of failure, but the University offset the risk factors with careful selection of competent faculty leadership, promotion among faculty on a personal basis, and the attraction of excellent master teachers. Over the 1986/87 academic year, good advanced planning, promotion and goodwill among the faculty made for reasonable reception of the project by the Spring of 1987. We also advertised $1,500 stipends for six weeks of study which was sufficient with all the other interesting features to attract the required fifteen faculty to begin the program in the summer of 1987. The University also aimed to share its findings and the seminar experience with faculty from other institutions with similar needs. It made ten $200 travel stipends available and advertised the project with a program brochure (enclosed) to 500 colleges, mostly independent private colleges or public colleges from our region. On July 6, 1987 we began the first week of faculty development seminars led by master teachers, and it was soon clear that advanced planning and hopes would be realized.

Through both summers, the faculty development phase followed a similar format. The schedule of activities for all of the seminars followed similar patterns. Participants met daily from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon on Monday through Friday. Each week they encountered a new set of texts introduced by an appropriate master teacher (see attached brochure for texts and master teachers, Appendix B). In the first three days, the central concern was the themes, issues, and possible interpretations of the texts themselves: an exercise in close reading. In the first summer, the master teacher was with us on the first day. During the second summer, faculty from Phillips introduced background material on a text. Then the master teacher opened the text on the

second through fourth days. On the fourth day, the participants--with or without the master teachers--explored the special relevance of each text for each core discipline. Participants sometimes broke into disciplinary groups to consider the text in question, and then appointed a spokesman to present their findings to the group. The point here was first that each discipline should examine the text from its disciplinary perspective, and second that all the disciplines should hear what that perspective yields from each text. The final day was devoted to more concrete matters of curriculum and pedagogy, and here again the disciplines sometimes met "in committee" and reported to the whole. The purpose here was that each discipline should discover a use and a place for the text in its own curriculum and invent strategies for engaging students in the study of it.

The most important task of the seminars was to conduct a communal reading of all the texts and so to lay the foundations of shared knowledge upon which curricular coherence or a core could be built among faculty. After the first year, faculty would be familiar with and could refer to all the texts in the Freshman English class (Aeschylus' Oresteia, the biblical text of Genesis, Dante's Inferno, etc.) That foundation would grow text by text, and the treatment of each would fall into three stages. The first stage was the straightforward reading of the text in question, with an acknowledged expert in the material laying out historical context, supplying appropriate methodologies for analysis, and suggesting fruitful lines of interpretation. This initial close reading occupied a significant part of the faculty's time in each seminar, and the close acquaintance was indispensable for the disciplines to use each text to its potential and yet avoid skewing its meaning or adopting it for special interests.

This respect for the integrity of the text became cardinally important for the next stage of discussion, because the object here was to uncover the special relevance of each text for each discipline. That relevance varied widely from one book to the next and from discipline to discipline, but if the material was chosen wisely it would never disappear entirely. Indeed, only classic texts have such wide-ranging relevances. Most every aspect of a work figured in these discussions, and it figured from every disciplinary point of view. There the master teachers earned their money. With prior briefing, theirs was the responsibility of mining each work for these points of disciplinary confluence--whether historical or thematic or methodological--that assured its utility in this enterprise.

The following scenario for the treatment of Dante's Inferno should illuminate a model for this second stage of discussion. After the master teacher, Dr. Rachel Jacoff of Wellesley, introduced the work and conducted a reading, it fell to the participants led by Dr. John Boots, to explore relationships between this and other texts in the core, and between those texts and the general concerns of their disciplines. Historians in the group began the discussion by focusing not just upon the utility of the Inferno as a portable archive, a case study in the ill-effects of the Donation of Constantine, but more importantly as an elaborately wrought philosophy of history. The fact that Dante takes Vergil as his guide implies not just a literary debt between one poet and his predecessor but also a certain relationship between one age and another, between the present and the past. The literary historian then shared this interest in Vergil-as-guide, but for slightly different reasons. For her the figure of Vergil obviously linked Dante with an earlier tradition, but beyond that it suggested a whole line of interpretation: the Comedy as conscious continuation of the Aeneid. For both, the discussion revealed points of convergence in their interest, convergences that can be exploited in their teaching to create new relationships among their

courses. Meanwhile, the art historian discovered interests that overlap with those of both the literary and political historian. Dante's allegorical and typological method, for instance--the method of representing abstractions via the concrete, or discussing present things in terms of past--will raise for the artist the whole issue of representation. And about that issue the literary and musical people found deeply-felt things to say. In our study of Dante, we explored musical representations of his work by Liszt in the nineteenth century. The discussion eventually yielded the assertion that, in his representation of this fictional journey, Dante is seeking to bring into synthesis all the wayward and disparate elements of his cultural inheritance. At that point, the art historian bought in the Gothic cathedral and the philosopher, St. Thomas' Summa, both of them examples of the high medieval urge to unite reason with revelation, Aristotle with Christ. Then the discussion became many-sided, with historians, philosophers, artists, religionists and literary people finding in Dante a point where their interests met.

The point here is not to cite a particular scenario for the discussion of a single text, but only to suggest the kind of interaction that usually took place in the process. It symbolizes the way that a more focused core developed. The great virtue of the process was not merely that participants discovered that they have things to say, each from his or her own perspective, about this work. The benefit is rather that their treatment of the work will reveal a commonality of interest that is frequently ignored or even denied in the life of the specialist. It was therefore cardinally important that each participant heard all the discussions. Each discipline must be aware of the interest that any text stimulates in the other disciplines. Only this kind of shared knowledge will generate the cross-disciplinary references that will produce integration and coherence in the curriculum. The goal of this stage of discussion in the seminars thus was to create a consensus within the faculty that--however different their surfaces--it is still the case that Dante's Inferno, Bach's B Minor Mass, Darwin's evolutionary theory, and the visions of human society expressed in the "Declaration of Independence" all spring from a single source: the educated imagination.

The third step in the seminars' treatment of each text involved the matter of effective and innovative pedagogy, and it too depended heavily upon the focused expertise of the faculty and master teacher. Since practical demonstration is more effective than theoretical discussion, it happened that this was less a state in itself than an integral component of earlier stages. It frequently happened, for example, that individual participants discovered new and innovative techniques for presenting material just by being apprised of the approaches that other disciplines would take to it. Effective teaching at the level of the core is at least partly a function of the breadth of the teacher's grasp of the material: the English teacher who can bring sociological or philosophical concerns to a literary text will automaticially engage a larger proportion of his general audience. Further refining and directing in the seminars occurred by the participants' conscious exchange of teaching strategies and by the communal reading and discussion of selections in educational theory. We read Whitehead, Perry, Kolb and others, but found the concrete representations by master teachers and our own acting out were most beneficial. This was especially true in the second summer. Each week the participants found ways of presenting materials with a fresh approach for the upcoming fall semester. The master teachers who provided particularly stimulating models in the Phillips seminar were Barbara Walvoord (English, Loyola College), who had several interactive styles, Rachel Jacoff (Italian, Wellesley College and Stanford University), with an energetic, wide-ranging mind, Alfred Mann (of the Eastman School) who had an engrossing, personal lecture style, and William

Mallard (of Emory) who worked at the blackboard but pulled huge insights from Augustine by making many comparisons with the present.

This completes the description of the activities that characterized the seminars proper. For the success of the program, however, it was crucial that we devised mechanisms for allowing faculty dialogue to continue beyond the seminar. An obvious method for doing this, of course, was simply to call continued meetings of the core faculty for the purpose of sharing information and coordinating of the business of implementation. This happened after each summer. During the fall of 1987, English faculty worked very hard on the new content for the foundational course in English 1114. Also in the spring with the administration we devised baseline evaluation tools and had a sample of students who took them. In the fall of 1988 the faculty completed and refined the syllabus for the new course (see Appendix C), and other courses began to include components related to English 1114 and the texts studied in the summer of 1988. Other reinforcement came about as well. In the fall of 1987 faculty and students did play for the entire University, an adaptation of the Oresteia. The administration supported reinforcement of the coherence approach with special study sessions on writing in the core curriculum. In the fall of 1988 the faculty devoted a special study session on the FIPSE project for the entire faculty. In the same period, two faculty went to a conference at the University of Chicago to observe some of the battles arising on the kind of content for general education curricula. The important leadership of articulate, engaged faculty created an ongoing impact.

Other strategies developed. One was to have faculty who were keen observers sit in and observe colleague courses. This happened in two of the English 1114 classes in the Spring semester of 1988. They became "members" of the class. They injected new insights to aid discussion of texts both directly in and also outside class. They also wrote reports (see Appendix D) to suggest how the project might be improved. Also, core faculty decided to meet regularly in 1987 and 1988 to continue the actual work of the summer seminar, i.e. to read and to discuss texts. At present, those meetings are taking the form of a weekly symposium on Dante and on major masses set to music. The identity of the text, however, is far less important than the character of the meetings, and Phillips will urge its partner institutions to build their follow-up programs around truly substantive materials. Only then will the cross-fertilizing benefit of real dialogue continue.

Project Results

Numerous results of this project should be reported. Certainly a major impact has occurred on faculty, especially the faculty at Phillips who teach in our general studies curriculum. Indeed as an analysis of those results proceeds, it will be clear that results on curriculum are closely related to faculty development. Reform of curriculum is a second major result that needs explication. A third impact area is on students. A fourth set of results should be reported on how faculty from outside of Phillips have observed the project. And a final area of reporting relates to the impact resulting from the broad dissemination of this project, far broader than originally intended. Indeed from the Phillips campus, this project had already cast a shadow in the region and has even gained some national attention.

The FIPSE project began with faculty, for without faculty no major changes can take place in curriculum or in students. The major impact on faculty came first through the six weeks of studying classic texts together. At first, the Phillips faculty were not used to talking with one another in a class-like setting or in a continuous dialogue on teaching and important texts. A review

of comments by faculty at the end of each summer seminar shows that faculty report a positive impact on them personally, their teaching and what they would teach. Almost all expressed the sheer joy of having learned an enormous amount from the reading of classic texts both for their personal edification and also for their teaching of material in the core courses. All concluded it was a great luxury to work with master teachers especially after the second summer. They all elaborated a heightened interest in pedagogy. Most realized that no matter the discipline all were reading major works in various ways. Beyond the clearly literary works, the scientist, Darwin, was reading the natural world, as was the mathematician or even Bach in creating the B minor mass. As Professor Allen remarked "So that I think that seeing different texts and different disciplines, reading different texts, and seeing different people read texts in different contexts. . . we can understand how to help our students become more self-conscious readers in all different kinds of disciplines." In the long run everyone thought they could pass on the understanding that they gained so their students could become more involved and highly educated. Indeed most faculty thought students could see more coherence in the curricula as faculty had come to appreciate interconnections. Faculty reiterated again and again most of aforementioned developments.

To convey the general results on faculty, one cannot begin to suggest the depth of impact from the FIPSE project. Although it is not feasible to explore the impact in depth on all the faculty, a few representations should be noted. Those who probably received the most were the ten faculty who participated in both summer seminars and brought their experiences into the classroom during the 1987/88 acadmic year. And of the ten, three were professors of English who would first introduce freshmen students to classic texts chosen through the FIPSE propgram. During the first summer, all found their content objectives fairly well met in what they needed to begin teaching texts not previously part of the freshman curricula. After the first summer, they, however, struggled to complete a new syllabus and make a successful introduction of the texts to students. By the end of the year they thought they had done an adequate job of introducing classic texts to freshmen. By June of 1988 they looked forward to another summer of study with broader objectives than those in 1987. They were looking at the art and practice of teaching the focus of general education rather than simply a study of subject and discipline. During the summer they all found a favorite model of master teacher. As one exclaimed, "Mallard (of Emory University) has been the best master teacher we have had in both summers. . .my purpose of continuing to read and to learn to be responsive to learners was reinforced by this man who shows it in action." Another English professor observed: "Walvoord was <u>supremely</u> useful. Her presentations will change the way I teach." By the end of the two year grant these faculty, who still do not agree on many matters, had adopted many insights from the FIPSE experience and had placed classic texts at the center of the freshman English curriculum.

Faculty who attended only one summer or those who attended both summers expressed similar sentiments and more. All have introduced a classic text or portion thereof into their courses. They all emphasize the value of close reading of texts. They want to continue studying together, and they will pay careful attention on how to apply their insights into their courses during the years ahead. Each has the concern that unless faculty keep working at interconnectedness, then much will be lost. Most have gained the insight that coherence cannot be achieved without careful efforts to dialogue about the structure of curriculum. Indeed, although they see possibilities to increase coherence at Phillips through faculty interchange and curricular work internally, they now fear that coordination of this program with other colleges

may take too much away from the Phillips effort.

Participants who observed the FIPSE program (over forty for at least three days) were very pleased with all aspects of the program. Several planned to speak to their academic deans in hopes that they might attempt a similar program or join Phillips in a new proposal to expand the project. As one participant from a state university observed on August 12, 1988:

> I would like to say just one thing briefly. I certainly developed a very healthy respect for the faculty at Phillips because of the intellectual curiosity shown through this kind of endeavor and also the intellectual courage to confront this many works of this complexity. I certainly congratulate you for that. I hope you know how lucky you are in a situation like this, how very remote such an idea would be at many institutions particularly state institutions and larger institutions.

We had most of our visitors during each summer, and most stayed for one week. There were two repeaters from one summer to the next. And one college sent four observers one week and another sent four over two summers. Most stayed a week because they were interested in both the subject or master teacher for the week. In the visitor's evaluation that we gave out each week, we found uniformly positive results (see Appendix I for the form). Almost everyone thought the seminars and arrangements were handled well and met their expectations. Very few pointed to any weaknesses, and those noted were minor, such as the need for more organized social time for visitors or longer time to study each text. Most made very glowing remarks about the quality of master teachers, professionalism of faculty and leadership at Phillips, friendliness and hospitality. All of these observers and even the master teachers remarked frequently on how valuable an experience it was for them. Steve Gustafson, one of the observers from McPherson College, which will join with Phillips in an expanded program in 1989, summarized well what others thought on questions six and seven of the visitor's evaluation.

> 6. How will your participation in the seminar contribute to curricular reform and coherence at your institution?
>
> McPherson College is pleased to be a satellite location for one of the Phillips University 1989 FIPSE seminars. As one of his major goals, our dean of academic services is emphasizing interdisciplinary cooperation. Through a study of our general education requirements and the establishiment of several interdisciplinary classes, our faculty is working to build further curricular cohesion. The Phillips University FIPSE Program can serve us as a model for further development of interdisciplinary cooperation, especially in the core curriculum.
>
> 7. Do you have any comments or complaints about the seminar not considered above? If so, what?
>
> Phillips University is to be congratulated upon reaching out to liberal arts institutions and inviting their faculty members to be a part of the FIPSE seminars. I am pleased to have had this opportunity and have grown through the experience.

Clearly the FIPSE project at Phillips has produced profound effects on

faculty, and with faculty development the impact on curriculum and pedagogy has grown as well. Following results chronologically will give a sense of how the impact has broadened the core curriculum at Phillips. Prior to the summer of 1987 all we had was a tacit agreement first among English faculty and then others to explore the possible usage of agreed on classic texts in the freshman and general education curriculum. Faculty for English 1114 reached enough of a consensus by the fall of 1987 to introduce most of the texts studied in the summer of 1987. Since then and for every semester faculty has taught Aeschylus's Oresteia, Plato's Dialogues, Genesis, chapters 1-3, Dante's Inferno, Darwin's Origin of Species, and Freud's Introductory Lectures. Echos of Plato's Dialogues will be heard every term in History 2213, "Western Civilization to 1715" and Philosophy 2003, "Introduction to Philosophy." The Genesis material will also reappear in Religion 1013, "Biblical Literature," taught every term. The Inferno will receive reconsideration in History 2213, "Western Civilization to 1715," offered each year and core courses in political science. And Darwin's Origin will again be considered in the Western Civilization and Introduction to Philosophy sections of the general education core. Snow's Two Cultures will reappear in the Western Civilization course and upper division courses in science; Whitehead's Aims of Education will reappear in major courses in professional education.

Other classic texts introduced in the summer of 1987 did not end up in freshman English, but immediately they found their place in other general education courses. Descartes' Discourse on Method found life in "Introduction to Philosophy" and "Western Civilization" for each term. In the summer of 1987, Phillips faculty studied the Federalist Papers and the Marx and Engels Communist Manifesto, then they appeared with special emphasis in general education courses on U.S. national government and "Western Civilization since 1715," as well as more advanced courses. Indeed it was something of a surprise to find faculty in higher level courses using the texts studied in the summer of 1987 for their courses as early as the 1987/88 academic year. It only proved what faculty had said in the evaluative questionnaire given in August of 1987: faculty believed the seminars had "laid a foundation in faculty dialogue that will lead ultimately to a more coherent curriculum."

Another unplanned feature that grew out of the 1987 summer study was a keen interest in ongoing collaborative efforts through the 1987 acadmic year. This resulted in numerous curricular enhancements. In late August before the academic year began, the FIPSE group invited Dr. Barbara Walvoord to discuss writing across the curriculum, especially in the core. Several began the school year with more carefully devised reading and writing assignments. Through the fall term, English faculty hammered out a rough syllabus and kept working on the new texts and their teaching through the academic year. In a burst of enthusiasm, a handful of faculty reread Dante's Inferno through the year and discussed their findings each Thursday at noon. The drama department in the fall of 1987 presented one of the summer texts, the Oresteia, in a production that involved forty students and faculty. In the same time frame faculty began to chose six more texts and master teachers to study in the summer of 1988. Faculty with the dean began to think about ways of measuring impact. Warren Bryan Martin, the external evaluator had visited the campus twice and encouraged efforts. Finally at the end of 1987 and early in 1988, after favorable results from a semester's teaching were in, the leaders in the FIPSE project dreamed of an even broader impact.

After attending the FIPSE director's conference in early December, the project director and academic dean, Dr. Shipps, began to talk about dissemination more broadly than doing small pieces for publication, announcing results in conferences or the impact on guest observers. As a result, the

faculty leadership agreed to think on ways of expanding the project to include ten other colleges. Then they agreed to apply for another comprehensive grant from FIPSE by March. Efforts to make a preliminary and final proposal consumed considerable energy in the spring semester of 1988, but other curricular results can be highlighted. Efforts to redesign the English 1114 continued. Baseline testing for the freshman course and student self perceptions were developed and administered. Two faculty from outside the English department observed the teaching in two English 1114 classes taught by the English faculty. These faculty concurred that students were achieving a depth of understanding below the surface of texts. They were comprehending the meaning and significance of classic texts. Both offered several ideas and agreed that faculty should hand out materials to give students more on setting and structure of texts. Both agreed it takes time to develop new approaches, but that Phillips was moving in the right direction.

During the second summer (1988) Phillips faculty studied six more classic texts that would reach beyond one field in general education. As it turned out the faculty agreed to introduce all the texts into at least one general education course. Of the texts studied, DeTocqueville's Democracy in America will probably appear in more courses than others. At least ten courses will refer to this classic. After two years on the FIPSE project, the Phillips curriculum now has at least one classic text studied in all but four areas of the general education curriculum - economics, natural sciences, art and physical science. Phillips faculty aim to involve those areas in future seminars. Certainly after two years on this project, Phillips has accomplished its curricular goal of introducing classic texts to sixty percent of its general education curriculum. And from all the self reports of faculty, they have devised teaching approaches that will be helpful in teaching classic texts (see Pallett's evaluation, Appendix A).

During the autumn of 1988 faculty have continued to reinforce and to broaden their drive to pursue the goals of curricular coherence through teaching classic texts. They are coordinating syllabi and learning materials in the new core curriculum featuring classic texts. They are studying Dante's Purgaturio for a Thursday discussion group and various musical masses during Wednesday luncheon groups. In order to aid the achievement of more coherence, several have begun to work on a canon of classics for the Phillips curriculum. They want to coordinate what is being offered during each semester. They also want to suggest standard editions and to set aside a special section for classic texts in both the University Library and bookstore. Indeed the Advisory Committee on the FIPSE project continues to function creatively, as proposed in the original grant, in emphasizing curricular coherence through the use of classic texts.

Effects of the curricular revisions and pedagogical innovations have certainly impacted on students and quite favorably so far. Students have grasped the new content and have reported high satisfaction in the regular, formal evaluations of English 1114 courses since the fall of 1987. Since the introduction of new content and teaching approaches, the normal number of students have passed these courses. In the fall of 1988 faculty report that students have seemed to enjoy the English 1114 courses even more as faculty have become more comfortable and committed in their teaching of the classic texts curriculum. During the fall of 1988, the editor of the student newspaper commented favorably on the FIPSE project and Phillips leadership when reviewing major issues in higher education. More obviously needs to be processed and evaluated as students work with new features of the core curriculum. Yet the attempt has been to make changes without fanfare, and thus far students have readily accepted the modifications. How coherence will fare in the minds of

students remains unclear. Casual comments from students to faculty about seeing connections from one class to another have already occurred. One must always recognize, however, that an abstract ideal such as coherence will be more of an ideal than a concrete reality at the level of students. Yet in two years students made as much progress as faculty expected. Over the next three years it will be up to those faculty and students to make the student results even more apparent.

Phillips has already disseminated its project beyond the campus. It has within two years created considerable visibility within the region and some notice on a national scale. Among university constituents the FIPSE program has received considerable dissemination. During the first year, word of mouth spread the central ideas among faculty. Press releases on the grant appeared in local newspapers and in Phillips publications. In the region and among independent colleges over five hundred received a brochure outlining program ideas (see Appendix B) and an invitation to send observers. Participant faculty observers, twenty of whom receive $200, disseminated the project on their own campuses. Most of the observers were from Oklahoma and Kansas institutions, but we had visitors from as far away as New Jersey, Minnesota, West Virginia and Wisconsin. Even after the first year we had faculty from four colleges who talked to or visited us to discuss our efforts in the core curriculum. One of our faculty, Professor Glenn Doyle presented the Phillips program at the regional meeting of the faculty attending CIC workshops in June of 1988. As we began our second year two institutions, Bethel in North Newton, Kansas and McPherson in McPherson, Kansas decided to pursue general education reform and wanted to pursue the Phillips model. About the same time the Oklahoma Foundation for the Humanities published in its Interview a feature trialogue on curricular coherence that included Dr. Shipps' observations on the Phillips program. That publication has a circulation of nearly 20,000, including major figures in education as far east as Washington, D.C. (see Appendix E).

After the second summer of study and receipt of the second grant from FIPSE, dissemination has broadened further to include a clearly national audience. Again the Oklahoma Foundation for the Humanities has highlighted the Phillips program in its winter issue of Interview, featuring Robert Detweiler, our master teacher for the week on Goethe's Faust. In the fall of 1988 the program director of the Council of Independent Colleges asked that Phillips summarize the program for deans attending their annual conference. From that summary statement, five colleges contacted Phillips asking to be considered in the new, expanded program for curricular coherence. Finally, FIPSE itself has encouraged a broadened impact. By granting financial resources for an expanded program over the next three years, it has guaranteed a national dissemination. In the next year ten more colleges will actively participate in the project. FIPSE has mentioned the Philips project in its publications and conferences that promote FIPSE projects.

The latest result of these dissemination efforts is an invitation to be part of the annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges in Washington, D.C., January 6, 1989. There Phillips will be on the program mailed to 610 public and private colleges that this year stresses the theme: "Overcoming Fragmentation: The Challenge of Connecting Learning." One of their objectives could have been written at Phillips three years ago, for they "ask how institutions can support faculty members who assume leadership in shaping dialogues across the campus and across the curriculum." This will be an excellent forum for addressing the threefold deficiency that Phillips recognized three years ago: a lack of important, agreed on content in the curriculum, the lack of clear interrelatedness in the minds of students and faculty from one course to the next, and the lack of effective teaching at the level of the

learner. What Phillips has discovered and can contribute will be projected to yet another national audience.

Evaluation

The evaluation plan for the two year Phillips project centered on a number of quantitative and qualitative measures. They measured a number of features in the project: 1)the involvement and favorable reaction both of Phillips faculty and faculty from other institutions as observers; 2)the introduction of classic texts into the general education curriculum; 3)the continuation of the project under faculty leadership beyond the endpoint of the grant; 4)the effects of curricular revisions and pedagogical changes on students; 5)various kinds of dissemination both locally and at the regional and national level; 6)completion of the project within the proposed budget; 7)finally, a favorable evaluation by a professional evaluator from outside the Phillips constituency.

To measure the involvement and favorable reaction of faculty we first counted the number who attended and then examined evaluations made by those who participated in the summer seminars. We aimed for twenty-five Phillips faculty and ten faculty from other colleges. We were successful in having twenty-five participate from faculty who teach core courses at Phillips. And eighteen of the faculty or 60 percent, as hoped, have used a classic text in their courses, preparing curricular materials such as syllabi, lectures and handouts to facilitate instruction on these classic texts. Furthermore, on a standard evaluation form given to Phillips faculty (see Appendix F), they all found substantial benefits in understanding classic texts, pursuing pedagogical devices to incorporate in their teaching of classic texts, and in creating a faculty dialogue for more coherence in the curriculum at Phillips. We have exceeded our expectations on the number of colleges represented by faculty observers. Most aimed to disseminate ideas and approaches from the project. Over forty faculty from twenty-three colleges attended the summer seminars over the last two summers. On an evaluation given out to participant observers (see Appendix D), everyone found the week's activities useful for their work as teacher/scholars. The great majority thought that the seminars offered ideas and insight that "might affect curricular decisions" at their institutions. Clearly we have equalled or exceeded our expected outcomes on the matter of faculty participation and preparation of curricular materials. To check on whether faculty at Phillips had introduced or would introduce classic texts (we aimed for 18 core faculty), we compiled a questionnaire of the texts studied. Then we asked FIPSE-trained faculty to indicate which of the texts had been or would be used and in what courses. We were able to have eighteen of our faculty introduce texts within the first year of the program. Three faculty who received training have left Phillips, so we did not have quite the impact on the curriculum that we expected. Still we had an impressive impact on the core curriculum, over sixty percent of the courses, and on several majors beyond the core courses. Indeed, the evaluations show that faculty have clear commitment to classic texts and to future coherence in the core curriculum.

To evaluate the continuation of the project beyond the endpoint of the grant, the original proposal simply asked that Phillips retain an internal Advisory Committee to pursue objectives once grant funds ran out. That Committee exists and currently has several items on its agenda. It is planning internal changes and comparisons in syllabi. It also plans to establish a Phillips canon of classic texts and to have those works specially represented in the bookstore and library. It further intends to continue summer seminars held by at least ten faculty at Phillips for the next three summers. This coming

summer the faculty will pursue Aristotle's Ethics and Picasso's Guernica. As time permits, the leadership has other activities to pursue such as ways to evaluate the projects on students, study group discussions and classroom observation. Clearly by all measures there is no question about the coherence project continuing at Phillips.

By the expansion of the project under a new grant, continuation of the project will have many new dimensions. Phillips has received funding from FIPSE to expand the project to ten other colleges. By that proposal Phillips plans to continue its own program, adding other classic works in science and art, as well as involve other members of the Phillips faculty who teach required courses. It also must follow through on a more sophisticated evaluation of its own students and the faculty at other institutions. Finally, it must recruit, promote and coordinate the efforts of ten other colleges and universities in curricular reforms similar to those accomplished by Phillips over the last two years. Obviously plans for continuation call for major steps particularly in collaboration with other colleges and universities. Success at those steps will be measured according to the FIPSE application (no. 1859), on "Building Curricular Coherence Through the Teaching of Classic Texts at Eleven Colleges."

In evaluating the two year proposal, the most limited results and primitive measures related to the effects of curricular revisions and pedagogical changes on students. Gauging impact of teaching and curricular change is not very sophisticated even among experts in assessment. The methods on the Phillips project were to check whether students passed newly revised courses and whether they rated the new course, English 1114, favorably in the regular course evaluations. By the ordinary means of testing, then, we checked on the success of curricular changes and pedagogical innovations. Clearly three-quarters of the students have sufficiently grasped the issues and meaning derived from classic texts to pass the newly conceived freshman course. And, according to the standardized course evaluations given at the end of each term, the students have reacted as favorably to the course as previous courses. Over seventy-five percent gave 1's and 2's ratings to their course over the last two semesters which means they rate it as either excellent or very good. Phillips did experiment in developing baseline data that might provide distinctive ways of discriminating the specific impact of content gained or attitude self report on classic texts curricula. It developed five questions for its annual ACT student attitude survey, administered each Spring (see Appendix G). It has the baseline results for the Spring of 1988, and will have to wait until 1989 for comparative data. It also created a ten-item multiple choice test for English 1114 (see Appendix H) and gave it as a baseline test. Testers have told us the test was too much of a recall test to determine any long term significance to the project. Currently, under the new grant we are, with the aid of a professional evaluator, attempting to construct a twenty to thirty item assessment that would specifically discriminate on student expectations, attitudes and synthesizing developments related to classic text teaching. Nevertheless, from traditional and common sense measures Phillips has successfully completed what it intended and with results that it views favorably.

On measures of dissemination, completion of project within the proposed budget, and favorable evaluation from a professional evaluator it is not necessary to report extensively. In the section on results for this report it should be clear that Phillips successfully disseminated the project internally, locally, regionally and beyond. It has successfully disseminated in its brochures, newspaper releases, presentations at CIC conferences, hosting of outside observers, articles in the Oklahoma Humanities Interview and obtaining a second grant from FIPSE to expand the project to ten other colleges. On the matter of budget, we have made prompt reports and have stayed within the given

guidelines through the two years. We have not asked for additional funds and seemingly have come within a few dollars of ending with a balanced budget. And on the outside evaluation we had one change in that indicator of our performance. Warren Bryan Martin served effectively for one year and recommended the Phillips project be expanded in the 1988 proposal for a new grant. But larger, pressing commitments on Martin forced us to seek another external evaluator. Early in 1988 we secured the services of Dr. William Pallett, who works at Kansas State University in the Office of Institutional Planning and Research. An Appendix A detailing Pallett's positive report on the Phillips project will be attached. After a personal visit to the campus, personal interviews with faculty, reviews of participant evaluations, the proposal and other relevant documentation, Pallett concluded:

> All available information suggests that Phillips University has been successful in identifying an approach which can improve the quality of undergraduate general education. Evidence suggests that the project has been a successful venture. It is a model that other institutions should find most valuable in furthering the objectives of their own undergraduate core curriculums, as well as nurturing faculty cohesiveness and sharing of ideas.

Summary and Conclusions

From very small beginnings, the ideas of a few faculty and their dean, the Phillips project has created a new, exciting emphasis at Phillips. It also has attacked major problems having to do with curricular fragmentation in higher education. The approaches identified and pursued at Phillips have worked well in a short period of time. Clearly without financial support and internal leadership the project had little prospect for success. But with careful planning, implementation and involvement by faculty, substantial changes have taken place. Those changes will endure and are already spreading to other institutions. Thus it now appears the Phillips project will have results impacting more than its students and faculty. It is already a model for other institutions in its reform of the core curriculum.

In conclusion, one could suggest several insights developed into why this was a very successful project. It attacked problems of consequence in higher education today, but it started with a scale that was manageable. It had good faculty leadership and participation on a scale that worked. Much latitude, initiative and responsibility fell to faculty. Sufficient financial means came along to enhance the excitement of ideas and growing commitment. The master teachers were very good and some were simply inspiring. And we did not overburden faculty with reports, extra tasks or responsibilities that they did not largely devise themselves. FIPSE input was quite limited but helpful as we concluded the project and planned to expand it. Helene Scher discreetly guided us along the way and gave a positive boost at the end. We still have not had help in devising better forms of evaluation. Yet heavy-handed administration either from the director or Washington would have slowed or shattered the progress made by a heavily burdened faculty. Admittedly we did not attain all of our ideas on developing course materials or create further forms of evaluation, but given the stress at Phillips financially and with leadership changes, the overall results were astounding. If given a project of great interest and fascination, it is simply amazing to see what faculty will do over two years, especially with intensive study during six weeks in two summers. Reading in their fields and beyond is of keen interest to faculty. So many positive features appeared in this program, it is clear that it will have

considerable staying power. We had established a program and a climate conducive to sustained productivity and creativity. There is no predicting how wide or rapid the spread of this project's impact, but it has even greater potential.

Appendices

A. Outside Evaluator's Report by William Pallett

B. Brochures of Summer Seminars, 1987 and 1988

C. Syllabus for English 1114, Revised in 1987 and 1988, to Center on Classic Texts

D. Faculty Observer Reports in English 1114, Spring 1988

E. Interview on "The Humanities and Coherence in the Curriculum," a publication of the Oklahoma Foundation for the Humanities (Winter of 1987), Winter of 1988 is forthcoming, a Summary is Included

F. Standard Evaluation Forms Used for Faculty Participants from Phillips and Completed Examples

G. Special Items on ACT Attitude Survey, related to Classic Texts Curriculum

H. Multiple-Choice Test for Content Comprehension in English 1114 (Baseline comparisons available for students who have and have not taken the class)

I. Visitor's Evaluation Form and Completed Examples

APPENDIX B

Project Descriptions of the College and University Participants In the Phillips/FIPSE Project on Faculty and Curricular Coherence, 1988-1991.

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PARTICIPANTS IN THE PHILLIPS/FIPSE PROJECT ON FACULTY AND CURRICULAR COHERENCE, 1988-1991
Dr. K. W. Shipps, Project Director--Phillips University-Enid, OK

Project Descriptions

Baker University

Baker University proposes a three week summer seminar designed to build upon curricular innovations already in motion. The existing program consists of two complementary parts: a series of "Critical Enquiry" courses leading to a senior capstone course; and a two semester interdisciplinary course that integrates writing and critical thinking with the study of important texts. The critical enquiry courses have been in place since 1979; the interdisciplinary course will be taught for the first time in 1990.

Baker University will use the proposed FIPSE Seminar to familiarize eight other faculty with texts that Baker students will encounter in the required interdisciplinary course. Proposed texts include Plato's Republic, works by Marx, and possibly Skinner's Walden Two. The seminar will be led by the Baker faculty who designed the course and who will actually teach the texts. Their efforts will be supported by guest lecturers from other institutions. The eight participants will be chosen from a wide spectrum of disciplines across the curriculum. Participants will discover how these required texts relate to their own disciplines, and so will be able to use and extend the common knowledge that students bring to their courses.

Contingent upon funding from the Kansas Commission on the Humanities, Baker University also plans to invite seven high school teachers to participate in the seminars. These participants will learn first-hand what is expected of students who attend small colleges, and they will have the opportunity of studying classic texts that might be incorporated in high school honors courses.

Program Director: Dr. Donald Hatcher, Baker University, Baldwin City, Kansas 66006. Telephone: (913) 594-6451.

Seminar dates: May 20--June 15
Master Teachers: J. Michael Young, Plato
Richard DeGeorge: Marxism

Bethel College

In the summer of 1989, Bethel College conducted the first of its three week faculty development seminars under the sponsorship of the Phillips/FIPSE Project on Faculty Development and Curricular Coherence. That seminar was designed to develop in faculty an appreciation of the value--both for teachers and for students--of the interdisciplinary discussion of classic texts and to explore the teachability of such texts. The ultimate end-in-view was to initiate discussions about the value of a core curriculum as opposed to the old distribution model.

Works for the seminar included Darwin's Origins of Species, Shakespeare's Hamlet, and De Tocqueville's Democracy in America. Discussion of each text was led by an outside consultant and gave attention both to strategies for teaching the work and to the potential utility of the text in a general education core.

Bethel's evaluation of the 1989 seminar reports that the experience made a good beginning toward turning an intellectual community fragmented by disciplinary loyalties into a genuine community of learners.

Bethel will conduct a similar seminar in the summer of 1990. Texts for that workshop have already been selected: Euclid's Elements, Bach's St. Matthew Passion, and selections from Karl Marx.

Program Director: Dr. Marion Deckert, Philosophy Department, Bethel College, North Newton, Kansas 67117. Telephone: (316) 283-2500.

Seminar dates: May 29--June 16
Topics: Bach, Euclid, Marx
Master Teachers: Michael Bauer (Bach)
Samuel Kutler (Euclid)2

ILLINOIS BENEDICTINE COLLEGE

Illinois Benedictine proposes a three week summer seminar that will introduce faculty to classic texts that will be incorporated in two pilot courses for freshmen, one in the Honors Program and one in the regular freshmen writing sequence. The seminar will bring together three elements in the College's on-going renovation of the general studies curriculum: the Honors Program, the Freshman Advising Program, and the Writing Across the Curriculum.

The summer workshop will follow the model introduced by

Phillips University. The ten faculty participants in the seminar will study three classic texts with the assistance of "master teachers." Five of the faculty will be from the Honors program, five from Freshman Advising Program and the Writing Program. Among the texts being considered are selections from Shakespeare, Freud, and Solzhenitsyn, and Freud.

At least one of the texts will be used in both the freshman honors course and the pilot freshman course for 1990-91. Experience with this text will provide a starting point for discussions for developing a common philosophy on curriculum. The ten participants in the summer workshop will be catalysts in a discussion that may eventuate in a freshman year "common course."

Program Director: Dr. Phyllis M. Kittel, Dean of Faculty and Instruction, Illinois Benedictine College, 5700 College Road, Lisle, Illinois 60532-0900. Telephone: (312) 960-1500.

Seminar dates: June 4--22
Master Teachers: David Bevington, Shakespeare,

Topics: Shakespeare, Solzhenitsyn,

McPherson College

In the summer of 1989, McPherson College conducted the first of two faculty development seminars to be offered under the Phillips/FIPSE Project. The goal of the seminar was to bring faculty together from each of the four divisions of the institutions to generate meaningful dialogue around three classic texts and to model three distinct styles of teaching through carefully selected master teachers.

Texts for the seminar included Aristotle's Physics, Shakespeare's Hamlet, and Whitehead's Adventures With Ideas. The format for the seminar was patterned after the Phillips model, with a master teacher leading discussion of the text itself for three days, followed by a Friday wrap-up session focusing on pedagogical strategies and curricular utility.

In its evaluation of the seminar, the McPherson group expressed special enthusiasm for the pedagogical value of the experience: "Before students can discover unexpected connections in their various classes, their professors must subscribe to a model of teaching which is not compartmentalized. The atmosphere for this cross-disciplinary style of teaching evolved in this summer's FIPSE seminars."

McPherson college will conduct a similar seminar in the summer of 1990. A steering committee has selected The Book of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Revelation as one of the texts and a series of classic films as the other.

Program Director: Dr. Steve Gustafson, Music Department, McPherson College, McPherson, Kansas 67460-1402. Telephone: (316) 241-0731.

Seminar dates: July 23--August 10
Topics: Classic Film
Book of Revelation

Mount Mercy College

Mount Mercy College proposes a three week summer seminar on the theme "Visions of Perfection: Utopian Thought as a Catalyst for Building Curricular Coherence." The seminar will focus on three classic utopian texts: Plato's Rebublic, More's Utopia, and Bacon's New Atlantis. Buckminster Fuller's Utopia or Oblivion will provide the occasion for summary discussions of fundamental questions raised by the theme.

The first two weeks of the seminar will center on conversations with a visiting consultant, followed by round table discussions of pedagogical issues arising from those conversations. During the third week the group will break into sub-groups to discuss Bacon and Fuller. The session will conclude with a computer simulation game called the Global Futures Game, designed to drive home the point that we need input from all the disciplines when thinking about the future.

Since the ten participants will be spread as widely as possible across the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural and mathematical sciences, both the texts and the ideas generated in discussing them will find their way into the core curriculum at several crucial points.

Program Director: Dr. Jean Sweat, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Mount Mercy College, 1330 Elmhurst Drive NE, Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52404. Telephone: (319) 363-8213, ext. 245.

Seminar dates: June 4--22
Topics: Plato's Republic, More's Utopia
Master Teachers: James Dye (Plato)
John Perlette (More)

Mount Saint Mary College

Mount Saint Mary College proposes a three week faculty development seminar focusing on classic texts and topics from three authors: Euripides, Toynbee, and Melville. The seminar is designed to enable faculty to assist students in building

connections among academic areas and to assist faculty in designing bidisciplinary courses.

The bulk of the seminar will revolve around conversations with a visiting scholar/presenter. In addition, however, each participant will spend at least two afternoons each week in the work of curricular design, collaborating with two or more colleagues to produce concrete plans for bidisciplinary courses involving the texts and topics of the seminar. By participating in the seminar, then, MSM faculty will not only come to new understandings of the interdisciplinary ramifications of these texts, but they will also develop strategies for presenting these understandings in classes to students.

In order to expand inter-institutional collaboration in the mid-Hudson region, MSM will invite interested faculty from other institutions to participate in the seminar.

Program Director: Sr. Loretta Butler, Mount Saint Mary College, 330 Powell Avenue, Newburgh, New York 12550-3598. Telephone: (914) 561-0800.

Seminar dates: May 14--June 9
Topics: Euripides, Toynbee, Melville
Master Teachers: Louis Roberts (Medea)
Thomas Africa (Toynbee)
John Samson (Melville)

Oklahoma State University

The Department of Sociology at Oklahoma State University proposes a three week summer seminar on classics in social thought, designed to support and facilitate the department's new and text-oriented core course, "Masters of Social Thought." This new course--the most popular of the Department's general education offerings--will replace lecture with intensive reading/discussion and will include a significantly expanded writing component. The seminar will focus on texts by Marx, Weber, Durkheim, and Tocqueville--all of which will be integrated in the new course--and will give significant attention to devising strategies for bringing these works alive for students. The seminar thus aims at enriching both a major and an important general education component at a large and diverse state instution

Participants will include twelve full-time members of the Sociology Department, all of whom are involved in the department's general education offerings. Faculty participants will take turns moderating daily discussions, and visiting scholars will be brought in for weekly evening lectures. An important part of the treatment of each text will be discussion of concrete pedagogical issues.

The works chosen for the seminar define in some way the essence of the sociological imagination and thus constitute a strong element in the classical tradition of the social sciences. Acquaintance with these writers will bring fresh insights into the intellectual and practical problems of our time and so will provide a basis for coherence not only in the sociology curriculum but within the University's general studies offerings.

Program Director: Dr. Charles Edgley, Professor and Head, Department of Sociology, 006 Classroom Building, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078. Telephone: (405) 744-6105.

Seminar dates: May 7-25
Topics: Marx, Weber, Durkheim, de Tocqueville

Phillips University

This summer Phillips University will hold its fourth consecutive faculty development seminar supported by FIPSE. The two-week seminar will focus on the teaching of non-Western texts to undergraduates and is designed to help integrate the University's incipient Asian Studies Program into the general studies curriculum.

Faculty from several disciplines will participate with visiting master teachers in an intensive discussion of the Bhagavad Gita and The Tale of Genji and will explore strategies for teaching the texts and for incorporating them into the core curriculum. Several faculty will begin teaching the texts next year as the new Asian studies program is implemented. Other participants will either teach them in the future or help integrate the Asian studies program into campus life in other ways.

Faculty from other institutions are invited to participate for all or part of the seminar. The Bhagavad Gita will be discussed the week of July 9, with Dr. Joseph Elder (University of Wisconsin, Madison) present as master teacher from July 10-12. The Tale of Genji will be the topic for the next week, with Dr. Meera Viswanathan (Brown University) present from July 16-18.

Program Director: Dr. Cate Ewing, Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma 73702.
Telephone: (405) 237-4433

SEMINAR DATES: July 9-20
Master Teachers: Dr. Joseph Elder, Bhagavad Gita
Dr. Meera Viswanathan, Tale of Genji

Presbyterian College

Presbyterian College proposes a three week summer seminar that will extend and coordinate two curricular efforts already underway: a Great Books Honors Seminar for Sophomores and a formal faculty development program centering on great books and their contemporary relevance. The FIPSE seminar will involve ten faculty members who have participated in the College's faculty reading program and who will also be involved in teaching the Great Books Honors Seminar.

The FIPSE seminar will center on two connected tasks: discussion of texts studied by the faculty during the previous year and final shaping of the Honors Seminar for students in the following year. Texts and discussions in the seminar will be organized around such themes as "Justice," "The Real," or "The Real." The general movement in each segment of the seminar will be from the ideal to the actual, theory to actuality, ancient to modern, Greek to American.

The seminar will not only provide an opportunity for cross-disciplinary exchange within the faculty; it will produce the final design of the text-oriented course those faculty will teach.

Program Director: Dr. J. William Moncrief, Vice-President of Academic Affairs, Presbyterian College, Clinton, South Carolina 29325. Telephone: 1-800-476-7272.

Seminar dates: May 7--24
Master Teachers: Donald Gray, Indiana; Robert Manning, Dennison
Topics: Darwin, Newton

St. Andrews Presbyterian College

St. Andrews Presbyterian College proposes a three week faculty development seminar that will focus on classic texts arranged around two themes: "Science, Civilization and Human Values" and "Global Impact of Non-Western Cultures." Texts will include Aristotle's Physics, the Bhagavad Gita, and selections from Darwin and Gandhi.

The ten participants in the seminar will all be involved in the St. Andrews General Education Program, and specifically with a required sequence of three courses entitled "World Cultures." One of the primary aims of the FIPSE seminar will be to produce new course units on the seminar's principal themes for each of the three chronologically arranged courses of the World Cultures curriculum.

During the first two weeks of the seminar, each of two visiting scholars, one with expertise in the history of science and one with expertise in non-Western literature, will lead the faculty

in discussions of the theme-oriented texts. The third week of the seminar will be devoted to separate planning sessions for the three phases of the World Cultures sequence. By the end of the seminar, each sub-group will produce in writing a plan for two teaching units, one related to each theme explored, complete with readings, objectives, teaching strategies, and outlines for in-class use.

Project Director: Dr. Charles W.Clark, Director of General Education, St. Andrews Presbyterian College, 1700 Dogwood Mile, Laurinburg, North Carolina 28352. Telephone: (919) 276-3652.

Seminar dates: May 21--June 15
Master Teachers: tentative
Topics: Aristotle, Dhagavad Gita

Roanoke College

Roanoke College proposes three week-long summer institutes focusing on classic texts to be incorporated in a humanities course that will be required as part of the College's new general education curriculum. Classic texts lie at the heart of the new curriculum, which consists of seven courses spread horizontally across four years. In each of these courses, students will study a common core of texts. The core lists for the seven courses are designed to be complementary, with students being encouraged to build on texts studied in earlier courses.

The proposed summer institutes will focus specifically on texts to be used in the three humanities/civilization courses that lie at the heart of the total curriculum. Each of the week-long institutes will focus on a single text, chosen as a centerpiece for one of the three civilization courses. Texts will include a musical work by Mozart, a piece by Solzhenitsyn, and a work by a modern minority novelist. Although intended primarily for the civilization faculty, the institutes will be open to all faculty and will be especially encouraged for those faculty teaching in other areas of the core.

The three institutes will follow a common pattern of organization and will share certain fundamental assumptions. Each will be led by an outside consultant who is a recognized authority in the field. Morning sessions will be devoted to close discussions of the primary text. Afternoon sessions will be devoted to presentations by the faculty participants from the perspective of their own disciplines.

Program Director: Dr. Susan Milligan, Department of History, Roanoke College, Salem, Virginia 24153-3794. Telephone: (703) 375-2411.

Seminar dates: May 1-4, May 21-25, May 28--June 1.
Topics: Mozart, Solzhenitsyn, Morrison

APPENDIX C

Student survey for FIPSE Project.

FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POST SECONDARY EDUCATION PROJECT (FIPSE)

STUDENT SURVEY (1989-1990 MODEL)

Name_____
(or student identification number)

==========

Your careful replies to the questions on this survey will be valuable in providing national curriculum designers at the U. S. Department of Education, FIPSE, and University/college planners with essential guidance for improving our undergraduate programs. It will also help us document the effectiveness of our undergraduate programs for accrediting associations or other external agencies. All replies will be considered confidential; only groups results will be reported. Although your identity will be protected, you should feel free to omit any question which you feel unduly invades your privacy.

==========

Part I. Curricular Questions

The following statements ask you to assess different components of your general studies curriculum experience. By general studies we mean a minimum number of courses that are wide-ranging, distributed across several academic disciplines (usually the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities) and required for most students outside of their major. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by circling the response options provided: (Circle only one response)

Strongly Agree (SA); Agree (A); Uncertain (U); Disagree (DA); Strongly Disagree (SD); Not Applicable (NA)

SA A U DA SD NA 1. My general education education classes have helped make me a better, more critical thinker.

SA A U DA SD NA 2. I prefer a curriculum where from one class to the next, I encounter the same great works from different perspectives.

SA A U DA SD NA 3. The teachers in my core or general studies curriculum classes taught at a level I could understand.

SA A U DA SD NA 4. Taking general education classes do not help me learn what I want to learn.

SA A U DA SD NA 5. As a result of the writing I have done in my core classes, I have improved my writing skills.

SA A U DA SD NA 6. I am confident in my ability to identify and summarize in writing the central themes of a work.

SA A U DA SD NA 7. I am not intimidated by reading lengthy and difficult works.

SA A U DA SD NA 8. There are too many core curriculum required courses, therefore, I don't have the opportunity to take courses I really want to take.

SA A U DA SD NA 9. I believe there are advantages to studying the same work in a number of different disciplines, like studying Freud in both English and Psychology.

SA A U DA SD NA 10. Courses in my general education experience seem to demand more knowledge and understanding as I progress from year to year (from freshmen to sophomore and so on).

SA A U DA SD NA 11. My core curriculum required courses are valuable part of my educational experience.

SA A U DA SD NA 12. Courses in my general education experience seem to relate to each other either because of connection that I made or connections others, such as the faculty, brought out.

SA A U DA SD NA 13. I don't understand why I am required to read old books.

SA A U DA SD NA 14. Courses in my major were broad enough to bring me into contact with knowledge or texts that I have encountered in my general education courses.

15. Place a number in the blank for the different classes at your college or university where you have read or heard about each of the following great works. If you have not been exposed to the work, please respond with a 0.

____ A. Darwin, Origin of the Species
____ B. Bible (Old and New Testament)
____ C. Aeschylus, Oresteia
____ D. Bach, Mass in B Minor
____ E. Plato, Apology, Republic
____ F. Verdi, Aida
____ G. Picasso, "Guernica"
____ H. Freud, Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis

____ I. Homer, Iliad
____ J. Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic
____ K. Aristotle, Physics or Ethics
____ L. Indian Rig Veda
____ M. More, Utopia
____ N. Shakespeare's Hamlet
____ O. The Parthenon
____ P. Sistine Chapel
____ Q. The Declaration of Independence
____ R. The U. S. Constitution
____ S. The Federalist Papers
____ T. Thoreau's Walden Pond
____ U. Marx, Communist Manifesto
____ V. Achebe's African novels
____ W. Confucius, Analects of Confucius
____ X. Bhagavad Gita
____ Y. The Koran or Qur'an
____ Z. Buddhist sutras
____ AA. Dante, Divine Comedy
____ BB. DeTocqueville, Democracy in America
____ CC. Euclid, Elements
____ DD. More, Utopia
____ EE. Lady Murasaki, Tale of the Genji
____ FF. Matsuo Basho, The Narrow Road of Oku

Please write the letter(s) of the three works from the above list above that you consider most valuable to you, then write a sentence or two in order to tell how they were valuable to you or a class.

____ 16. If you have taken courses in your major, please give us the number of courses you have completed.
A. One B. Two or three C. Four or five
D. More than five E. Not applicable.

PART 2 PERSONAL PROGRESS

As a result of your experiences at your institution, how much progress do you feel you have made in each of the following areas? (Circle only one alternative per item.)

Very much = VM
Quite a bit = QB
Some = S
Very little = VL

1.	Gaining a broad general education about different fields of knowledge	VM	QB	S	VL
2.	Developing an understanding and enjoyment of art, music and drama	VM	QB	S	VL
3.	Broadening your acquaintance and enjoyment of literature	VM	QB	S	VL
4.	Writing clearly and effectively	VM	QB	S	VL
5.	Becoming aware of different philosophies, cultures, and ways of life	VM	QB	S	VL
6.	Developing your own values and ethical standards	VM	QB	S	VL
7.	Understanding yourself--abilities, interests, and personality.	VM	QB	S	VL
8.	Understanding other people and ability to get along with different kinds of people	VM	QB	S	VL
9.	Understanding the nature of science and experimentation	VM	QB	S	VL
10.	Understanding new scientific and technical developments	VM	QB	S	VL
11.	Becoming aware of the consequences (benefits/hazards/dangers/values) of new applications in science and technology	VM	QB	S	VL
12.	Ability to think analytically and logically	VM	QB	S	VL
13.	Quantitative thinking--understanding probabilities, proportions, etc.	VM	QB	S	VL
14.	Ability to put ideas together, to see relationships, similarities and differences between ideas	VM	QB	S	VL

15. Ability to learn on your own, pursue ideas, and find information you need. VM QB S VL

APPENDIX D

Faculty survey for FIPSE Project.

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education
Faculty and Curricular Development Project

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

Under the terms of the FIPSE grant, your institution is required to submit periodic evaluations. With your permission the FIPSE advisory committee at your institution and designers of the project at Phillips University will use this questionnaire for that purpose. All replies will remain confidential; only group results will be reported. Although your identity will be protected, you should feel free to omit any question that you think is an undue invasion of your privacy.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement below by choosing one of five alternative responses: A. Strongly agree. B. Agree. C. Disagree. D. Strongly disagree. E. Uncertain or non-applicable.

1._____ "Too seldom is collegiate teaching viewed for what it is: the activity that is most central to all colleges and universities."

2._____ "Given the reward system in the profession of higher education, based largely on research scholarship, faculty should focus their primary energies on specialized, first order scholarship."

3._____ "Teaching should be a private preserve protected for individual faculty by the principle of academic freedom."

4._____ "Too many professors still stand as tellers of truth, inculcating knowledge in students; too many students sit and listen passively--or not at all."

5._____ "Since learning by students is a form of a private, personal development, we should not be concerned with teaching methodologies or assessment, even if by faculty colleagues."

6._____ "In their own development faculty should primarily support university objectives that emphasize collective work to improve instruction rather than highly specialized, disciplinary scholarship."

7._____ "Curricula should be organized to encourage students to proceed sequentially from introductory or foundational courses to more advanced, specialized levels."

8._____ "With the complexity and growth of knowledge, the undergraduate experience should start early in one or two disciplines and then focus on a deepening comprehension of those disciplines rather than attempts at breadth, general learning competencies or education."

9._____ "Since students see their undergraduate experience as a "rite of passage", a credentialing process, curricula should largely be one of free choice and relatively easy to complete."

10.____ "Faculty should engage in an ongoing conversation among themselves not only about their disciplines but also what should be related among their disciplines."

11.____ "Faculty should not be expected to strive for and become accountable for an organized, connected curriculum."

12.____ "'Classic works' (problems, art, literary texts) should be in courses of general education at our college or university."

13.____ "Classic works, although sometimes interesting, are not necessary or liberating in today's collegiate study."

14.____ "Almost every classic work is simply too difficult to teach to most of today's college students."

15.____ "Classic works, although sometimes difficult for students, are works that I need to teach."

Please fill in the following blanks for demographic analysis. You need not include information that you believe would be an invasion of your privacy.

Age _____ Sex_____

College/University_____ Department_____

Field of Teaching Specialty_____

Years of College Teaching _____

Degrees Beyond Bachelors_____
(Degree and Institution)

DATE: October 29, 1991 APPENDIX D

TO: All Faculty

FROM: Dr. Kenneth W. Shipps, Provost

RE: Final Questionnaire for FIPSE

Please respond by November 8 to the following questionnaire.

FIPSE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR

Under the terms of the FIPSE Grant, Phillips University is required to submit an evaluation to the U.S. Department of Education. Your responses to the following questions will contribute to that process.

1. If you were new to the Phillips faculty since 1986, please indicate the year when you joined the faculty:_____.

2. If you participated in any FIPSE summer sessions, please indicate how many and the years:_____.

3. Part of the FIPSE project is related to teaching masterworks or classic texts; please respond to the inventory below.

   Using 1 - to indicate you have heard about the named work
   2 - to indicate that you have read or have more than a passing knowledge of the named work
   3 - to indicate you use this work in one of your courses
   4 - to indicate you require this work in one of your courses
   * - use an asterisk to denote if 1, 2, 3 or 4 were the result of the FIPSE project

   Use the highest number possible in that if you would use a 4, it would be assumed that 1, 2, and 3 are also true.

_____ A. Darwin, Origin of the Species
_____ B. The Bible
_____ C. Aeschylus, Oresteia
_____ D. Bach, Mass in B Minor
_____ E. Plato, Apology, Republic
_____ F. Verdi, Aida
_____ G. Picasso, "Guernica"
_____ H. Freud, Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis
_____ I. Homer, Iliad
_____ J. Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic
_____ K. Aristotle, Physics or Ethics
_____ L. Indian, Rig Veda
_____ M. More, Utopia
_____ N. Shakespeare, Hamlet
_____ O. The Parthenon

_____ P. Sistine Chapel
_____ Q. The Declaration of Independence
_____ R. The U.S. Constitution
_____ S. The Federalist Papers
_____ T. Thoreau, Walden Pond
_____ U. Marx, Communist Manifesto
_____ V. Achebe's African novels
_____ W. Confucius, Analects of Confucius
_____ X. Bhagavad Gita
_____ Y. The Koran or Qur'an
_____ Z. Buddhist sutras
_____ AA. Dante, Divine Comedy
_____ BB. DeTocqueville, Democracy in America
_____ CC. Euclid, Elements
_____ DD. Lady Murasaki, Tale of the Genji
_____ EE. Matsuo Basho, The Narrow Road of Oku
_____ FF. Snow, Two Cultures
_____ GG. Whitehead, The Aims of Education
_____ HH. Eiseley, The Immense Journey
_____ II. Descartes, Discourse on Method
_____ JJ. Goethe, Faust
_____ KK. St. Augustine, Confessions

4. Your local Phillips FIPSE Advisory Committee would also appreciate your comments and ideas concerning: (a) courses with an emphasis on or intensification of reading and writing beyond what we currently have in the curriculum, (b) how to continue the FIPSE concept on summer seminars for faculty on teaching texts, (c) a student masterworks library, and (d) if or how your teaching has changed as a result of the FIPSE program. Your comments on these areas or other observations would be much appreciated.

Please return to the Provost's office by November 8.

KS:nm

APPENDIX E

Wrap-Up Conference Materials, Local Coordinators at Phillips, July, 1991.

Period 4:
Read: Canto II
Discuss: Identity of Virgil
Virgil as Human Reason
QUERY: Who are the "three ladies" who sent him? Why that particular chain of command?

Week of March 4

Period 1:
Read: Cantos III-V
Discuss: the Vestibule and free will
Limbo and the limitations of reason
QUERY: How does Dante cross Acheron? Why is that mode of crossing significant?

Period 2:
Re-read: Canto V
Write (formal): Define Francesca's character. (What is the character flaw that leads her to commit the sin that results in her damnation?)
Discuss: Freedom of the will
Francesca and her sin

Period 3:
Read: Cantos VI-VII
Write (informal): Compare the transitions Dante and Virgil have so far made from one circle to the next. How concrete are the descriptions? How aware does Dante seem to be of his movement?
Discuss: Comparison of the sins of 1st 5 circles
QUERY: Is the downward progress moral or only geographical?

Period 4:
Read: Cantos VIII-IX
Discuss: Dante's reaction to Filippo Argenti
Virgil's discomfiture
QUERY: What do these two events mean for Dante's spiritual progress?

Week of March 11
SPRING BREAK

Week of March 18

Period 1:
In-class exercise: Diagram Dante's experience in upper Hell
Write (informal): Compile a list, in order, of the ten most critical experiences in Cantos I-IX. Be prepared to explain and justify your choices.
ASSIGN: MAJOR ESSAY # 2 (Due on Tuesday, 26 March)

Period 2:
Read: Cantos X-XI
Discuss: Organization of Hell
Sin as descent from reason
Sin as descent into selfishness

Period 3:
Read: Cantos XII-XVII
Write (formal): In a one-page essay, explain why murder should be the **least** of the sins of violence.
Discuss: Organization of sins of violence

Period 4:
Read Cantos XVIII-XXX
Discuss: Nature of malice
Organization of Malbolgia
QUERY: Why should such sins as hypocrisy and flattery lie deeper in Hell than lust or murder?

Week of March 25

Period 1:
Read: Cantos XXXI-XXXIV
Discuss: Compound fraud and the topography of lower hell

Period 2:
Conclusion: the time scheme of the journey
MAJOR ESSAY #2 DUE

Period 3: **ESSAY EXAM ON INFERNO**
Question will focus on conception of justice in Inferno (as work, not as place).

Period 4:
Read: Darwin, Origin of Species, Chapter 1
Discuss: Why are there more varieties of domestic pigeons than of wild pigeons?

Week of April 1

Period 1:
Read: Origin, Chapter 2
Write (formal): Write a short essay explaining why Darwin is interested in the fact that species in large genera show more variety than species in smaller genera.
Discuss: Testing the hypothesis

Period 2:
Read: Origin, Chapter 3
Discuss: Why is it significant that most of the offspring produced in any generation fail to survive? What determines which die?

Period 3:
Read: Origin, Chapter 4
Discuss: If varieties in nature and varieties in domestic breeds are produced by parallel processes, what in nature plays the role of the breeder? What is natural selection? What circumstances favor the operation of natural selection? What is sexual selection?

Period 4:
Read: Origin, Chapter 15 ("Recapitulation")
Discuss: What is the strategy of Darwin's argument? Which is prior for Darwin, theory or observed fact? How does he test his theory? What would constitute "proof" of the theory? What would constitute "proof" for opposed theories?

Week of April 8

Period 1:
Read: Eiseley, Immense Journey, Chapter 1
Write (formal): To judge from Chapter 1, what does Eiseley's title mean?
Assign: Major Essay #3 (Due Wednesday, April 18)

Period 2:
Read: IJ, Chapter 2
Discuss: Journey motif

Period 3:
Read: IJ, Chapters 3-5
Discuss: What are the "journeys" figured in these chapters?

Period 4:
Read: IJ. Chapters 6-8
Write (formal): How does the evolution of Homo sapiens differ from animal evolution?
Discuss: The "dream" animal
Eden metaphor in human evolution. What is the "fall?

Week of April 15

Period 1:
Read: IJ, Chapters 9-10
Discuss: If Homo sapiens is unique, what explains that uniqueness?

Period 2:
Read: IJ, Chapters 12-13
Discuss: What is the "secret of life"?

Period 3: **FORMAL ESSAY # 3 DUE**
Discussion: Compare Eiseley and Dante as pilgrims

Period 4: **ESSAY EXAM ON EISELEY**
Topic: thematic structure of Immense Journey.

Week of April 22

Period 1:
Read: Freud, Introductory Lectures, 1-2
Discuss: premises of psychoanalytic theory

Period 2:
Read: IL, 3-4
Write (formal): Adopting the voice of Dante Alighieri, respond to Freud on the subject of his theory of the unconscious.
Discuss: Implications of theory of unconscious for traditional doctrine of free will

Period 3:
Discuss: Freud, Darwin, and the priority of theory over "fact"

The **FINAL EXAMINATION** will be written during finals week.

The question: You have encountered the materials of this course in chronological arrangement, and that order has emphasized certain relationships among the texts and concealed others. For your final essay, you are to **re-arrange** these texts in order to reveal different relationships--and thus to make a different course. Your essay should consist of an explanation and defense of the order you select and should contain a description of the course that would result.

PHILLIPS UNIVERSITY FIPSE CONFERENCE

Coherence in the Curriculum Through Classic Texts

July 22-26, 1991

Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma

Monday, July 22:

Forenoon: 8:30-9:30
Registration: Central Foyer, Gantz Center
Coffee and doughnuts

9:30-10:20. Fireplace Lounge
Welcome. A short history of the Phillips FIPSE Project.

10:30-12:00. Fireplace Lounge
Panel: Classic Texts in the Phillips Curriculum: Successes and Problems.

Afternoon: 1:00-2:20. Fireplace Lounge
Panel: Bethel and McPherson

2:30-4:00. Fireplace Lounge
Panel: Baker and Mount Mercy

Evening: 6:00
Dinner: An optional adventure among Enid's restaurants.

Tuesday, July 23:

Forenoon: 9:00-10:20. Fireplace Lounge
Panel: Presbyterian College and St. Andrews

10:30-12:00. Fireplace Lounge
Panel: Illinois Benedictine and Roanoke

Tuesday Afternoon: 1:00-2:20. Fireplace Lounge
Panel: OSU and Mt. St. Mary

2:30-4:30. Gantz 1-2
Barbara Walvoord.
Presentation: **Helping Students Approach Texts.**

Evening: 7:30. Zollars 106
Showing of Antigone

Wednesday, July 24:

Forenoon: 9:00-10:20. Gantz 1-2
Barbara Walvoord.
Workshop: **Helping Students Understand Texts: A Blizzard of Ideas for Classrooms.**

10:30-12:00. Gantz 1-2
Barbara Walvoord.
Workshop: **The Blizzard Continues.**

Afternoon: 1:00-2:20. Gantz 1-2
Barbara Walvoord.
Workshop: **Helping Students Understand Texts: How to Handle the Paper Load.**

2:30-4:00. Gantz 1-2
Barbara Walvoord.
Workshop: **Topics Selected by Participants**
--Using Peer Collaboration
--Guiding Students' Reading
--The "Coverage" Issue
--Provoking Lively Discussion

Evening: 8:00. Reception. 2022 West Cherokee

Thursday, July 25:

Forenoon: 9:00. Gantz 1-2
Barbara Walvoord
Workshop: **Responding to Student Writing on Texts.**

Afternoon: 1:00. Gantz 1-2
Barbara Walvoord
Workshop: **Creating Conversation Within the Faculty on Curriculum and Pedagogy.**

Evening: Dinner (optional)

Friday, July 26:

Forenoon: 9:00. Fireplace Lounge
Panel and wrap-up round table.
What Do We Have Our Students Read?

* * * * * * * * * * * *

APPENDIX E

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Phillips University FIPSE Conference

July 22-26, 1991

Baker University

Dr. Donald Hatcher
Baker University
Baldwin City, Kansas 66006
Tel.: 913 594 6451

Bethel College

Dr. Marion Deckert
Department of Philosophy
Bethel College
North Newton, Kansas 67117
Tel: 316 283 2500

Illinois Benedictine College

Dr. Phyllis M. Kittel
Dean of Faculty and Instruction
Illinois Benedictine College
5700 College Road
Lisle, Illinois 60532-0900
Tel: 708 960 1500

McPherson College

Dr. Steve Gustafson
Department of Music
McPherson College
McPherson, Kansas 67460-1402
Tel: 316 241 0731

Mount Mercy College

Dr. David Ard
Department of Religion & Philosophy
Mount Mercy College
1330 Elmhurst Drive
Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52404
Tel: 319 363 8213

Dr. Robert McMaster
Director of Faculty Development
Mount Mercy College
1330 Elmhurst Drive
Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52404
Tel:319 363 8213

Mount Saint Mary College
Sr. Loretta Butler
Mount Saint Mary College
330 Powell Avenue
Newburgh, New York 12550-3598
Tel: 914 561 0800

Oklahoma State University

Dr. Charles Edgley, chair
Department of Sociology
006 Classroom Building
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078
Tel: 405 744 6105

Phillips University

Dr. John P. Boots
Department of English
Phillips University
University Station
Enid, OK 73701

Presbyterian College

Dr. Jerry Frey
Department of Psychology
Presbyterian College
Clinton, South Carolina 29325
Tel: 1 800 476 7272

St. Andrews Presbyterian College
Dr. Charles Clark
Director of General Education
St. Andrews Presbyterian College
1700 Dogwood Mile
Laurinburg, North Carolina 28352
Tel: 919 276 3652

Roanoke College
Dr. Susan Millinger
Department of History
Roanoke College
Salem, Virginia 24153-3794
Tel: 703 375 2411

ENGLISH 1114: INTRODUCTION TO LANGUAGE
Section 01, Spring, 1991

Instructor: John Boots
Office: Zollars 105
Hours: TH 9-12 or by appointment

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

READING ASSIGNMENTS:

A glance at the course calendar will show that English 1114 is largely a reading course. The reading list is fairly long, and the texts are significant primary documents that will require close attention and several re-readings. Class discussions will be designed to help you understand what you have read and thus to give you facility in the art of critical reading, but those discussions will be meaningless unless you have done the reading first. Furthermore, the writing assignments--on which your grades will be based--will all derive from the reading. The first requirement for success in the course, then, is that you **actually do the reading.** Such guides as Cliff's Notes and Monarch Notes, though perhaps useful as an aid on your first trip through a text, are no substitute for reading the work itself. Used by themselves, these guides constitute a trap from which it will be difficult to extricate yourself.

WRITING REQUIREMENTS:

Writing assignments for the course will be of four types: informal exercises, short position papers, major essays, and essay exams. The assignments will be related in series, building-block fashion, so that shorter and less-formal assignments constitute necessary stages in the writing of larger and more formal productions.

Informal Exercises: These are idea-gathering exercises designed to focus your reading and generate ideas for class discussion. Since their purpose is primarily pedagogical, they will not be turned in but should be filed in a portfolio you will keep during the semester. Each informal exercise will contribute in some way to the writing of a more formal piece.

Position Papers: These are mini-essays of a page or two written in answer to narrowly defined questions about particular works. In spite of their short compass they are to follow the essay form rigorously: strong statement of thesis followed by well-developed support followed by solid conclusion. These papers need not be typed but they should nonetheless represent careful, thoughtful work. Do a rough draft first, then edit and revise it. After the first few weeks you will probably find it easiest to produce them on the word processors. You will write 12-14 position papers in the course of the semester--an average of one per week. Because they are so frequent, they may not be revised for a higher grade. They must be turned in on time; **no late position papers will be accepted.**

Major Essays: These are formal papers, 4-5 pages in length, written to illuminate some major aspect of a single work. The major essays represent your very best work. They are to be well organized, coherently argued, cleanly typed, and edited to the point where they are error-free. The paper you turn in should represent at least three stages of work: a rough draft, an initial revision, and an edited and polished final version. **Do not turn in a rough draft.** You will write three major essays during the course of the semester and will have the opportunity to revise each of them, if you choose, for a higher grade. Your final grade on each paper will be the average of the grade on your first version and the grade on your final revision. The revising process will be easiest if you do your work on the word processors.

Essay Exams: There will be five exams in the course. Only the final will be comprehensive. The first four exams will be unit tests, each covering a small small cluster of texts. The questions will be synthetic: they will ask you to discover similarities or points of significant contrast among two or more texts. These exams will be written in class, but you will be given broad hints about the nature of the question in advance and will be allowed to refer to texts and class notes as you write. Your prose need not be of the polished sort expected in formal essays, but your answers must be coherently organized, well documented, and must follow the essay form rigorously.

GRADING

Your final grade for the course will be determined as follows:

Average of 10 best Position Papers	33.33%
Average of three formal essays	33.33%
Average of five examinations	33.33%
Total	100%

ATTENDANCE

Class attendance is mandatory. The penalty for the first eight cuts will be only indirect: you will know less about the works under discussion and so will perform less well on the writing assignments. **THE NINTH CUT BRINGS AUTOMATIC FAILURE.** In other words, you cannot pass this course if you miss more than eight class sessions. The wisest policy, of course, is to miss none.

APPENDIX E

ENGLISH 1114
CALENDAR OF READINGS AND ASSIGNMENTS
Autumn, 1990

Week of January 7

Period 1:
- Course Introduction
- Goals, objectives, requirements
- Computers
- Distribute Hutchins essay; define assignment

Period 2:
- Read: Hutchins, "Autobiography of an Uneducated Man"
- Write (informal): Outline the **argument** of this essay:
  - I. Problem
  - II. Solution
  - III. Conclusion
- Discuss: Nature of argument
  - Concrete to abstract: the generalizing process
  - Hutchins' definition of the problem
  - Shape of an essay

Period 3:
- Write: One-page essay defining Hutchins' **solution**
- Discuss: Define "liberal arts" and "great books"

Period 4:
- Discuss: Freedom within the tradition
  - Application of Hutchins to Eng 1114
- Introduce Aeschylus
  - Study questions for first 800 lines:
    - What is Chorus thinking about?
    - What their attitude toward the war?
    - Toward Clytaemestra?
    - What is their mood?
    - What are their hopes for the future?
    - Why?

Week of January 14

Period 1:
- Discuss: The essay: Guide to the 3-part structure
  - Critique sample of Hutchins essay

Period 2:
- Read: "Agamemnon," Introduction and lines 1-800
- Write (informal): Answer study questions (see Period 3)
- Discuss: Background as Chorus remembers
  - Past operating in present
  - The Curse

Period 3:
Read: Finish "Agamemnon"
Write (informal): List Clytaemestra's reasons for killing the king
Discuss: Vengeance masquerading as "justice"
Roles of Chorus and Cassandra

Period 4:
Write (formal): One-page essay defining Clytaemestra's conception of "justice" in "Agamemnon"
Discuss: What is the "curse" on the house of Atreus?

Week of January 21

Period 1:
Read: "Libation Bearers"
Write (informal): List Orestes' motives
Discuss: Oresteia as historical fable
Oresteia as argument
Critique: Sample "Clytaemestra" paper

Period 2:
Write (formal): One-page paper comparing Oreste's motives with Clytaemestra's
Discuss: The role of Apollo

Period 3:
Read: Begin "Eumenides"
Read student essay
Discuss: Critique student essay
"Libation Bearers": Anarchy vs. despotism
"Eumenides": Apollo and the Furies

Period 4:
Read: Finish "Eumenides"
Write (informal): In separate columns, list what Furies seem to want and what Apollo seems to want
Discuss: Nature of the "debate"

Week of January 28

Period 1:
Write (formal): One-page essay explaining the nature of the compromise in the "Eumenides"
Discuss: Historical movement of the Oresteia
Assign: FIRST MAJOR PAPER (due Tuesday, February 12)
The question: How does the conception of justice evolve through the three sections of the Oresteia?

Period 2:
Read: Dialogues of Plato, Introduction, pp. vii-xxii
"Apology," pp. 1-26
Discuss: Introduce Socrates and historical context
Organization of "Apology"

Period 3:
Write (informal): Paragraph defining the charges against Socrates
Discuss: Socrates' introduction and method

Period 4:
Write (formal): One-page paper explaining what Socrates achieves by answering the "old" charge
Discuss: Relation between old and new charges

Week of February 4

Period 1:
Discuss: Second and third "speeches"
Query: Why does Socrates not plead seriously for a lesser punishment?

Period 2:
MAJOR PAPER ON AESCHYLUS DUE
Introduce exam question

Period 3:
Review "Apology" and Oresteia

Period 4:
ESSAY EXAM OVER PLATO AND AESCHYLUS
(Consider Socrates as "stage four" in the evolution of justice). Bring "blue books" to class.

Week of February 11

Period 1:
Read: Genesis, chapter 1
Discussion: Study questions (to be handed out)

Period 2:
Discussion: Day Six--the specialness of mankind
"Fact" versus "truth"

Period 3:
Read: Genesis 2, 4-25 (Creation II)
Discuss: Comparison with Creation I: contradiction or complement?
Write: One-page paper describing the conception of God that emerges from Genesis 1.

Period 4:
Read: Genesis 3 (the Fall Story)
Discussion: The nature of Eve's sin. What is she tempted to?

Week of February 18

Period 1:
Discussion: Etiology and the punishment (What does this story explain?)
What conception of justice is at work here?
Compare with Socrates.

Period 2:
Read: Genesis 4, 1-16 (Cain and Abel)
Discussion: Are the "facts" of this story consistent with earlier stories?
What conception of divine justice emerges from this story?

Period 3:
Read: Exodus, chapters 1-18
Write: IN-CLASS QUIZ OVER EXODUS
Discussion: General shape of the story

Period 4:
Write (formal): What conception of God and man emerges from the Exodus story?
Discussion: Comparison with earlier Biblical narrative

Week of February 25

Period 1:
ESSAY EXAM OVER OLD TESTAMENT NARRATIVES (The exam will focus on the conception of justice that emerges from these stories. Bring "blue books" to class.)

Period 2:
Read: Dante, Inferno, Canto I
Discuss: Outline of whole Divine Comedy
Dante's Universe
Significance of "3"

Period 3:
Re-read: Inferno, Canto I.
Discuss: Allegory and the "Letter to Can Grande"
Relation between Dante's journey and Exodus
Literal details of Canto I (Be able to recount them.)

APPENDIX F

William Pallett's Phillips-FIPSE evaluation report, November, 1991.

APPENDIX F

Phillips-FIPSE Evaluation Report
William H. Pallett

Through prior FIPSE funding Phillips University embarked on a process which addressed three deficiencies its academic community believed were present in its core curriculum. Those deficiencies were: 1) "a lack of truly important content in the curriculum," 2) "a lack of cohesion from one required course to the next", and 3) "a lack of effective teaching at the level of the learner."

At Phillips, a grassroots faculty response to these concerns won rather quick acceptance. Classic texts were viewed as the best approach to insure that important content be included in the curriculum. The Phillips faculty believed that works that had stood the test of time, were relevant to today's concerns, or held aesthetic value, merited inclusion in their core curriculum.

Phillips' faculty addressed the second concern by creating both an awareness and an opportunity to learn about the selected "classic" texts through a series of FIPSE sponsored summer seminars. Each classic work was studied for one week. Typically a master teacher was brought to campus to discuss the work and suggest pedagogical approaches that might be used when teaching the text. The content of a required freshman English class was modified to include "classic texts" studied in the initial summer

seminars. Faculty who participated in the summer seminars and taught other courses were encouraged to include those classics in their courses where appropriate. All of the texts included in the freshman English class had an interdisciplinary perspective and encouraged an understanding that knowledge is interconnected.

The third goal--teaching to the level of the learner--was also an important element of the master teacher's responsibilities. In fact, master teachers were selected for their pedagogical talents as well as their knowledge of the work.

Response to the Phillips plan was so well received by the campus community that many expressed the belief that its curricular model merited consideration at other campuses. As a result, Phillips officials applied for and received the current FIPSE grant, Building Curricular Coherence through the Teaching of Classic Texts at Eleven Colleges. The eleven cooperating institutions were: Phillips University (OK), Bethel College (KS), Baker University (KS), Illinois Benedictine College, McPherson College (KS), Mount Mercy College, Mount Saint Mary College (NY), Oklahoma State University, Presbyterian College (SC), St. Andrews Presbyterian College (NC), and Roanoke College (VA).

Except for Oklahoma State, these institutions are similar in character, but their current general education curriculums were

extremely diverse. St Andrews Presbyterian was founded in 1961 with a "classics core" in place and have had an on-going commitment to the classics. Every faculty member is expected to be able to teach the interdisciplinary courses in their general education curriculum. They became involved in this FIPSE grant to add classics materials to their existing curriculum, not to revamp it. In contrast Bethel College currently had no commitment to a "classics curriculum" and no clear consensus has been reached among faculty as to what their core curriculum should include. But, historically Bethel has had a strong disciplinary emphasis and when their core is defined it will probably be tied to the disciplines rather than to the classics. While these were the institutional extremes, all of the institutions' core curricula were distinctive; and the institutions were not at the same point in the process of curricular reform.

A summary of interviews and other data gathered from participating institutions concerning the development of general education programs, and an evaluation of those programs, follows.

The Formal Evaluation Process

A primary goal of the grant was for seven of the participating institutions to integrate the three central elements of the Phillips plan (content, cohesion, and pedagogy) into their curricula. The reports offered by campus representative during the final conference in July (1991) indicated that at least six institutions either have curricula in place that are similar to the Phillips model or are moving toward implementing the Phillips model. Saint Andrews Presbyterian, Roanoke and Baker made commitments to the primary components of the Phillips model prior to becoming involved the grant. They effectively used grant support to modify and enhance their core curriculums which had already won support faculty support on their campuses.

Phillips, of course had won faculty acceptance of integrating the classics into their curriculum. They used these FIPSE-summer seminars to study additional classics that would be added to a number of upper and lower division courses. Again, works were selected which were interdisciplinary in nature and therefore could be studied from a number of perspectives.

St. Andrews Presbyterian and Roanoke used the FIPSE grant to modify their curricula which already had a strong classics texts component. St.Andrews used the seminar to add non-western works and works related to the history of science. Roanoke used the

seminars to add Greek philosophy (Plato's Republic), Classical composers (The Marriage of Figaro), and Afro-American Authors (Beloved by Toni Morrison) to its general education courses.

Baker faculty also supported a classics orientation in their curriculum and added a freshman general education class during the 1990-91 academic year. This course emphasized the development of critical thinking skills through the use and analysis of classic texts. The Phillips grant was used in large measure to win support for this new approach and general education class.

McPherson has proceeded slowly, but has made outstanding progress toward implementing a curriculum similar to the Phillips model. The progress has been much greater than was anticipated during this evaluator's 1989 visit.

McPherson integrated classics texts by including them in a new credit-granting freshman orientation program. Two classic texts (works by Marx and the Parables) and a classic film festival were included in a Freshman College Life program, a highly personalized and integrated (social and academic) freshman year experience. Based on their understanding of the faculty and institutional culture, proponents are introducing the classics at a rate which they believe will lead to a substantial and lasting commitment to the use of classic texts.

APPENDIX F

Both Mount Saint Mary and Illinois Benedictine made significant gains toward implementing classics core curriculums which contain the three primary components of the Phillips model. While Mount Saint Mary is further along in the process than Illinois Benedictine, both institutions have demonstrated a commitment to the inclusion of classics texts in their respective curricula.

The tragic death of a leading proponent of the integration of classics texts, the resignation of two other faculty supporters and the departure of another faculty member who took sabbatical leave decimated the classics leadership at Illinois Benedictine. These setbacks in leadership have delayed implementation of a new or revised core. While no new courses using classic texts were implemented in 1990-91, one new course (non-core) which uses classic texts will be offered during the Fall of 1991. In addition, Illinois Benedictine has initiated a three-year plan which will lead to the integration of classics texts in their required curriculum.

Mount Saint Mary also experienced some delays in gaining faculty acceptance of the idea of integrating classic texts into their core curriculum, but during the Fall of 1991-92 they will offer their first bi-disciplinary course. It is intended for second semester sophomores. Three other bi-disciplinary courses

have been developed and are in the process of winning faculty approval.

Institutional representatives at both institutions credit most of the gains they have made toward their curricular modifications to participation in the Phillips-FIPSE program.

Presbyterian College, like McPherson, is proceeding cautiously. Faculty and administrative leaders sympathetic to a "classics" emphasis hope they can generate additional support in an unobtrusive fashion by introducing classics texts in a sequence of honors courses.

In the fall of 1990 they initiated a series of one-credit honors courses for sophomores and juniors. This past academic year the works of Newton and Darwin, studied in the 1990 FIPSE summer seminar, were the topics for the first two seminars. Future summer seminars and later courses are planned to study the works of Freud (Fall, 91), Marx (Spring, 1992), Newman, and Machiavelli. Twenty to thirty students were enrolled in each of the seminars during the 1990-91 academic year.

Through the honors courses, faculty from many disciplines will be exposed to the "classics" approach and its possibilities as part of a core curriculum. While it is unclear as to whether the

"Phillips-FIPSE" model will win support at Presbyterian, the type of exposure the curricular model received would not have been possible with out participation in the grant activities.

While not impossible, it is unlikely that either Mount Mercy or Bethel will adopt a curriculum similar to the Phillips model. Debates about the content and role of general education at both Bethel and Mount Mercy have been going on for quite some time. While the "Phillips FIPSE" seminars were viewed as extremely useful, they did not lead to a commitment to integrating classic texts into the curriculum at either institution.

People at Mount Mercy believed that the seminar experience came too late. Their debates over general education were nearly concluded at the time the Phillips--FIPSE seminars began. Nonetheless, while nothing is currently in the offing, there is evidence that the college will continue investigating the use of classic texts.

The Bethel experience demonstrated the importance of timing and leadership in curriculum development. The President and Dean of the college both supported a classic text general education component but both have left the college. While there is a proposal on the table, a new core curriculum which integrates classic texts will likely not win approval without vigorous support

from the leadership. The institution's "disciplinary" history and culture made it difficult if not impossible to win support for the alternative model developed at Phillips.

Oklahoma State failed to provide any information about their program. Therefore, it is impossible to know what contributions the grant has made to their curriculum development.

The implementation of a new curriculum, or even slight modification of an old one, is a sensitive, complex and time consuming activity. Institutional history and culture; current administrative support; faculty members' talents, interests, leadership skills and personal experiences with core curricula all impact campus curricular change. Add to that the political agendas often motivated by departmental self-interest (e.g. what if the new curriculum reduces credit hours generated in my department?) and it's surprising that circumstances ever coalesce sufficiently for change to occur. Given these difficulties, the outcomes of the Phillips-FIPSE seminars have to be viewed as positive.

Six institutions either have in place or are committed to a curricular model similar to that currently in place at Phillips. The possibility exists that at a seventh institution, Presbyterian, groundwork will result in successful implementation as well. Therefore, there is a realistic prospect of having seven

institutions with a curricular model emphasizing content, coherence and pedagogy.

Institutional representatives and faculty members reported extraordinarily favorable reaction to the seminar experience. The goal of 75% satisfaction with the seminar experience was easily met.

What follows are a representative sample of quotes from faculty participants and institutional representatives from the participating institutions:

> "It was for me the highlight of a very rewarding summer"
> -- Mount Saint Mary faculty member

> "The major impact of the seminars was the sense of increased cooperation among divisions of the college -- the sharing of ideas across the disciplines which was enormously stimulating.
> -- Mount Saint Mary faculty member

> "The facilitator/experts were able to encourage both scholarly and highly practical activity."
> -- Mount Saint Mary faculty member

> "It was genuinely refreshing to interact with my peers in this joint enterprise to improve the curriculum at Baker."
> -- Baker University faculty member

> "I appreciated the teamwork involvement with fellow faculty. Although having taught for twenty years at Baker, I discovered many common interests as we clarified value interests across disciplines."
> -- Baker University faculty member

"I was most curious about the content of this particular sequence of required courses and was initially hesitant as to the justification of their inclusion into our general education program. ... I am now a true believer and enthusiastically support the course sequence."

-- Baker University faculty member

"At times I was frustrated and confused, feelings which students must feel at times, too. Being a student again helped me to identify and empathize with students more. ...Another way the workshops affected my teaching resulted from the collegiality and relationships formed. ... Most importantly, the FIPSE workshops made me aware of different teaching styles and methods which helped me broaden my repertoire and expanded my practices."

-- McPherson College faculty member

"Generally speaking, the workshops have given me many ideas that have generated the creative juices to get moving again."

--McPherson College faculty member

"After spending six weeks, three hours per day, with my peers studying classic texts, I grew to know my fellow educators at a new level. In a setting where depth of conversation could develop, one could see the interrelationship between the disciplines and the connections across the curriculum."

--McPherson College faculty member

"The Phillips/FIPSE seminars in May, 1990 were certainly successful, as the evaluations show. The faculty found them intellectually stimulating. They prepared the faculty to work with authors/composers and works that are now being taught. They helped to build a sense of community among the Civilization faculty that has been of enormous value in developing interdisciplinary courses that represent a significant challenge to faculty members. They helped increase the level of intellectual comraderie on a campus on which conversation has tended recently to focus on campus politics. All of these consequences have ultimate impact on the students."

--Roanoke College faculty coordinator

"Marvelously successful at creating intellectual community"

--Bethel College faculty coordinator

With one exception, each institution sponsored two one-week seminars with at least 8 participants, with a master teacher leading and guiding discussion of classic texts. The exception was St. Andrews Presbyterian, which because of time constraints, sent four faculty off-campus in the fall of 1990 to meet and discuss works with master teachers. Clearly, goals described with regard to type and number of seminars to be conducted at the institutions were successfully achieved.

The area of evaluation that was not completed as planned was the student evaluation component. While the external evaluator was not aware until the wrap-up conference that the second phase of survey administration was completed by only two institutions, the decision not to administer follow-up surveys was sensible. There is no reason to administer pre-post tests if no curricular innovation has been implemented. In research terms, why would change be expected if there has been no treatment administered?

Since only four institutions implemented any curricular change during the 1990-91 academic year (Baker, McPherson, Phillips and Presbyterian), they were the only institutions where follow-up student surveys could provide useful evaluation information. Of those four, Phillips made only minor additions to a curriculum that had been in existence for five years; therefore little change could

be expected on that campus. Presbyterian's classics program included two one-credit courses and reached an extremely small and distinctive portion of its student body. While those developments should not be minimized, participation was not substantial enough to detect change from the student survey responses.

The remaining two institutions, Baker and McPherson, both introduced courses that all freshmen must complete. While their evaluation activities did not match the plan described in the grant, their efforts were noteworthy and the results are summarized later in this report.

The intentions to do survey research were well intended. However, the decision to not engage in a rather costly and time consuming second phase of survey activity in order to complete the formalities of a grant evaluation was a good decision. Student growth and development was as much a goal for the participating institutions as it was for FIPSE. But, the grant participants and external evaluator tried to fit a student evaluation process into a timeframe that was unrealistic. Indeed, this evaluator was rather naive in thinking that something as controversial and ego-involving as core curriculum could be both endorsed and implemented so quickly. It is possible that the most important student outcomes will not be known until long after the grant has ended. It would be desirable for FIPSE to find a way to extend the

evaluation component of projects such as this until two or three years after the rest of the project has been completed.

While the assessment of student outcomes could not be a part of this report, the development of the survey instrument and its administration as a pre-test should prove useful to future assessment efforts. It is expected that both the survey (or parts of it) and pre-test data will be used in the future by the seven institutions involved in curricular change.

Indeed, Phillips hopes to use many of the materials developed for these grant activities to continue to assess the impact of its curriculum. Phillips plans to survey its 1989-92 alumni next summer in an effort to make some an assessment of the longer-term effects of its new curriculum. Responses of alumni who completed the "old" general education curriculum will be compared to those who completed the "new" curriculum in order to see whether the new curriculum has resulted in distinctive long-term change.

One other change should have been made with regard to the evaluation plan. The eleven institutions selected to participate in this grant were at very different stages with regard to curriculum review and development. The substantial programmatic

differences among these institutions should have been addressed by creating more institution-specific evaluation designs rather than the common design which was selected.

Attachment A is a summary of Dale Goldsmith's assessment of the impact on the Phillip's seminar on students and faculty at McPherson. In brief, both quantitative and qualitative assessments offered by Dr. Goldsmith indicate that the Phillip's seminar has made substantial contributions to the curriculum at McPherson. Indeed the Freshman College Life program, the program most influenced by the Phillips-FIPSE seminars, is believed to be responsible for some dramatic increases in student retention at the college. The three year average freshman to sophomore retention rate improved from 63% for the three years prior to the implementation of the Freshman College Life program to 72% following its introduction. In addition, of the four faculty who were evaluated using the ETS Student Evaluation of Instruction instrument prior to and following Phillips-FIPSE experiences, three experienced improved ratings of instruction. While a cause-effect relationship between the grant and positive outcomes cannot be proved, the outcomes were consistent with that expectation.

Baker did administer the survey designed for use as part of the Phillips-FIPSE seminar. The pre-test group of Baker students responded much less positively to the first 14 items of the survey

(dealing with the essential components of the grant curriculum) than the sophomores who were surveyed in the fall of 1991. While the 1991 sophomore response rate was only 49%, the group responded more positively than their counterparts from the year before on 11 of the 14 items.

In addition to the survey administration, students who completed the course sequence were pre and post tested using the Ennis-Weir test of critical thinking. Dr. Donald Hatcher of Baker reported statistically significant improvement was achieved by students who completed the sequence.

Finally, student course evaluations were administered; outcomes ranged from extremely positive to very negative. Course satisfaction appears to be influenced more by who was teaching the course than course content.

The Summer Seminars

It is unusual to reach consensus about anything in academe, but the faculty representatives responded in remarkably similar fashion about their FIPSE-Phillips summer seminar experiences.

A common, but erroneous, stereotype of life on a college campus has faculty regularly talking to colleagues in other

disciplines about great ideas and issues of intellectual importance. In reality, it is rare, even on smaller campuses, for collegial relationships to develop among faculty members from dissimilar disciplines. One of the universal benefits of the Phillips-FIPSE seminars was the development of intellectual community. Susan Millinger from Roanoke College noted: "Faculty are better able to introduce students to an intellectual community when the faculty sees themselves as members of such." Indeed every institutional representative from the ten campuses who attended the summer conference, in one way or another talked about how much the seminars contributed to community building. Participants also noted that building community among a rather diverse and often highly critical group is no easy task.

While building intellectual community was the most often cited benefit of the seminars, several other positive outcomes were cited nearly as often. They included: renewed intellectual curiosity, a better understanding of colleagues, an increased appreciation of the talents of colleagues, a greater appreciation of good teaching, an opportunity to explore curricular questions in a healthy fair-minded environment not so dominated by self interest, increased dialogue about ideas long after the seminars ended, increased emphasis on exploring ways to improve the teaching-learning process (see attachment B, Walvoord letter).

The discovery of a process that universally resulted in the above outcomes is extremely important. The seminars were as valuable a tool for those who were considering substantial curricular overhaul as they were to those who were making minor modifications to their curriculum. The seminar process always seemed to force better questions and take curricular issues to a higher plane than might be encountered in politicized faculty meetings or administrative-faculty debates.

The story of the Phillips process demonstrated the complexity of curriculum development. Three faculty members got in the habit of coming to campus before 7:00 A.M. to discuss core curriculum matters. The Dean found out about this and offered his encouragement and support. Eventually, enough progress was made and enough enthusiasm was created that a FIPSE proposal was developed and funded. The outcomes of the first FIPSE seminars so positively influenced other faculty that the new curriculum gained widespread acceptance. A long sequence of events preceded curricular change and without an effective catalyst (in Phillips case, three faculty members) it would not have occurred.

Curriculum development does not evolve in a predictable, or in any way scripted manner. Rather it results from a series of serendipitous events which are mutually supportive. While not every institution who participated in the Phillips-FIPSE summer

seminars will copy the Phillips curriculum, the seminars have been 100% effective in being a catalyst for the participating institutions, a catalyst that builds intellectual community and forces the right kind of educational questions. The process can be expected to lead to improved educational outcomes.

ATTACHMENT A APPENDIX F

McPHERSON COLLEGE

McPHERSON, KANSAS 67460
(316)241 0731

September 20, 1991

Dr. Bill Pallett
Planning and Evaluative Services
Fairchild Hall 215
Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS 66506

Dear Dr. Pallett:

Enclosed, please find material which may be used as part of your external evaluation of our participation in the recent FIPSE project conducted on the McPherson College campus under the aegis of Phillips University FIPSE project for faculty and curriculum development.

McPherson College was eager to participate in this program primarily as an opportunity for faculty development, particularly with the goal in mind of improving interdisciplinary studies and moving towards a more coherent and cohesive curriculum which might eventually emerge from the opportunities faculty would have. In the course of our involvement in the FIPSE program, approximately one-half of our entire faculty was able to take part. Some of them (Flagg, van Asselt, Baker, Green) participated only in week-long seminars on the Phillips campus. Another 16 participated in two 3-week-long summer sessions on our own campus. One was in both. (Our total faculty numbers approximately 38.)

Of these 20 persons, a significant number have had impact on the curriculum in several ways.

First, a total of 14 of them have served as freshman advisors in our freshman College Life program, which began in 1988. This program divides all freshman students up among 9 or 10 selected faculty advisors each year--faculty who have the experience and the qualities to deal with the particular problems of the new freshmen. The "coherence" which was a goal of the Phillips FIPSE program has definitely found its way into this group and through this group into the student body via the College Life program in which they take a significant part by instructing these small groups of the 9 to 11 students 1 hour a week in class for the first semester of their freshman year and as academic advisors for the entire freshman year and, in some cases, beyond. The group of 9 or 10 freshman advisors/College Life instructors meets as a group once a week to plan and evaluate their teaching, and in addition all attend the large lecture, which is the third hour of the class, once a week. So there is a social and an intellectual coherence that has emerged through College Life, in no small part as a result of the faculty members' participation in the FIPSE seminar. Secondly, the retention among freshman students from freshman to sophomore year over the past several years has risen as the following summary indicates:

CLASS OF	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
% Retained	56	63	63	63	50	66

Institution of "College Life" program and participation in FIPSE

CLASS OF	1988	1989	1990	1991
% Retained	71	69	76	?

This suggests (among other things) that the students are deriving a more coherent and understandable grasp of their own academic experience. While this is certainly not hard evidence or a clear connection, one can at least speculate on reasons for increased student retention, and I would argue that the whole philosophy that the FIPSE faculty development seminars represent is one that has been grasped and translated into some fairly concrete structures and activities.

The second summer of our FIPSE seminars focused on community, and this certainly pointed directly to the transfer of the teaching methods and some of the concepts involved in that summer seminar into the freshman College Life program.

The attached sheet summarizes FIPSE participants' participation and evaluations. I will make an effort to relate the impact of the FIPSE experience in the evaluation of faculty as I am able to do so on an attached sheet. This will give some idea of how faculty evaluation was affected, directly or indirectly by the FIPSE participation. Participants in a FIPSE summer program is indicated for each of 20 faculty (18 of whom are still at McPherson). The next column (B) indicates their participation in the College Life program for freshmen. Column C indicates the semester(s) in which they taught interdisciplinary seminar; they would have shared the full teaching responsibility with one or two other faculty for the entire semester, engaging in the most complete form of team teaching possible--practicing coherence! (One seminar replicated a Phillips FIPSE seminar: Bach's B minor Mass.) Columns D1 and D2 indicate whether the instructor has been evaluated <u>before</u> and <u>after</u> FIPSE involvement, with Column E noting items on the SIR which show improvements between D2 and D1 that may be attributable to FIPSE experiences.

The numbers in Column E refer to specific questions on the SIR evaluations:

6 Lectures were too repetitious of what was in the textbook
7 The instructor encouraged students to think for themselves
10 The instructor raised challenging questions or problems for discussion
14 The instructor summarized or emphasized major points in lectures or discussions
36 I would rate the overall value of class discussions

The enclosed faculty questionnaires were filled out on August 28, 1991.

In addition, anecdotal self-evaluations by some FIPSE participants would be available should you desire it.

I hope this information is of assistance to you. The FIPSE program has certainly been a vehicle for focusing our attention on the whole matter of curricular reform and coordination, interdisciplinary thinking, and faculty improvement in many ways. I just wish these things could be measured in a more objective and persuasive fashion.

Cordially,

Dale Goldsmith

Dale Goldsmith
Vice President for Academic Services

DG:mm

Enclosures

cc: Ken Shipps, Phillips University

ATTACHMENT B APPENDIX F

209 Churchwarden's Rd.
Baltimore, MD 21212
August 15, 1991

William Pallett
Planning and Evaluation Services
215 Fairchild Hall
Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS 06502

Dear Bill:

As you requested, I am writing to report the outcomes that I observed from my position as workshop leader during the FIPSE project. At both Bethel College and McPherson College, I led summer workshops of several days to help faculty develop their knowledge of classical works, but most of all to help them teach the works effectively to undergraduate students.

A central characteristic of my workshops always is to help each faculty member prepare a course plan, by the end of the workshop, that reflects his or her experiences and learning in the workshop. Each person also receives feedback about his/her plan from me and/or from colleagues in the workshop. In that way I try to guarantee that the workshop will result in actual change in what faculty members do in the classroom.

My experience indicates that faculty actually do make significant changes in the classroom as a result of my workshops. For the past 20 years, I have conducted 15-20 workshops each year. For the past 5 years, about 80% of my workshops have been at schools where I have given workshops in the past. Thus I have a good chance to find out what faculty have done since the earlier workshop. Always I find that most of the faculty have made changes in their teaching.

At Bethel, the story was the same. My FIPSE workshop was the second time I had visited the Bethel campus. During that second visit, I talked directly with most of the people who had attended the initial workshop, and heard about the changes they had made. I have every reason to believe that the FIPSE workshop, too, resulted in changes in the classroom.

At both Bethel and McPherson, I found faculty attentive, responsive, and interested. They were eager and enthusiastic participants, not different from the best of the colleges I normally visit--the colleges where I return again and again, each time seeing for myself that the workshops result in changes.

I hope that this report about outcomes, as I have observed them from my vantage point as a workshop leader who returns to work again and again with faculty as they make changes in their teaching, will be helpful to you.

Sincerely,

Barbara E. Walvoord

Barbara E. Walvoord, Ph.D.
Director of Writing Across the Curriculum
Professor of English
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH 45221